

A Treatise on Conscientious Objection to War, Capital Punishment, and Homicide

By
Benjamin J. Salmon
September 1920

Originally submitted to a Doctors Conference at St. Elizabeth's Hospital for the Insane, Washington, D.C., which was investigating the author's mental condition.

(Note: First six pages were apparently patient history and were withheld for privacy concerns.
Title page added by transcriber. Salmon did not title this work.
Explanatory endnotes added by transcriber, Steve Smith, 2016.)

At this juncture, patient requests that he be permitted to state in detail the incidents leading up to his arrest and conviction, the different stages of his confinement and the condition thereof, and, lastly, a brief but thorough explanation of why he, as a Christian, disbelieves in war and accepted imprisonment rather than participate in war.

On June 5, 1917, I signed a Registration Card, but wrote on it that I was a conscientious objector to military service, that I would not go to war, and I informed the members of the Registration Board that in signing the card I did so not for the purpose of signifying my willingness to serve in the army, but for the purpose of specifically stating the contrary while at the same time complying with the law in so far as possible for me to do so without giving aid and comfort to the enemy of Christianity -- militarism.

Since long before June 5, 1917, I had made known my opposition to war in lectures and in articles written for the press and for publication by myself. In July, 1914, I wrote a small article entitled THOU SHALT NOT KILL and had it printed in a little weekly paper that I was editing and publishing at that time. At my trial in the Federal Court for refusing to sign the Questionnaire, a witness' testimony was offered in evidence to prove that several years previously, he was attending a meeting at which I delivered a lecture against war. This witness was a reputable business man in the community, one whose testimony could be relied upon. My opposition to war was not an opposition that manifested itself after America joined the World War, but had been in evidence for many years before both in printed and spoken words.

On December 26, 1917, I wrote a letter to the Local Board, acknowledging receipt of the Questionnaire, telling them that because of religious convictions against war I would not return the Questionnaire, quoted from the Scriptures, and among other things said: "I am legitimately entitled to exemption, a wife and widowed-mother to support, but I will not use my relatives to shield me from an institution against which my soul rebels."

In January, 1918, I was arrested for refusal to fill out and return the Questionnaire, released on \$2,500 bond pending the trial.

A few days before my trial, I was expelled from the Knights of Columbus for having published an article entitled: KILLING THE WRONG MEN. The sentiment expressed in the article was entirely Christian, pointed out that it was wrong to kill anybody but, if killing was to be insisted upon, those responsible for wars -- kings, presidents, kaisers, etc. -- should be made to fight each other and not drag millions of innocent youths into a game where they would be compelled to slaughter each other. My expulsion from the Knights of Columbus was supposed to be kept secret by them, not that I cared whether they kept it secret or not, but their laws prohibit making such matters public. It seems that they did not have any scruples about violating their oaths, for, my expulsion was featured on the front pages of the daily papers the following day, and, to make certain that nothing would be lost, the newspaper article stated that I was expelled by a unanimous vote, whereas the fact was that my expulsion was engineered by a trial committee of three acting illegally in the absence of one of their members. In other words, two members of the Knights of Columbus expelled me from the organization because I had dared to print the truth, which action was entirely consistent with my duty as a Knight of Columbus and in perfect harmony with the oath that I took as a member when joining that organization. I am not vexed because of my expulsion from the Knights, but I have mentioned this incident in such detail because it was a factor in my life as an anti-militarist that has gone a long ways in formulating public opinion against me. It must be understood though, that the action of the Knights of Columbus did not in any way affect my affiliation with the Catholic Church, except of course that it prejudiced many Catholics against me.

Responding to the demands of public opinion, and no doubt convinced themselves of my guilt, I was convicted by the jury in the Federal Court for refusal to return the Questionnaire, sentenced in March, 1918, to nine months in the Denver county jail.Appealed the case to the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals, because I maintained that the Questionnaire was unconstitutional. Released on \$2,500 bond pending the appeal to the higher court.

Rule XIII of the Selective Service Regulations reads: "Any person at large on bail under criminal process, shall be placed at the bottom of Class Four until the final disposition of his case and he shall be treated as standing at the bottom of Class Four until the final disposition of his case." The Local Board ignored this provision of the Selective Service Regulations, placed me near the top of Class One and kept me there, and, on May 18 they sent me a summons to entrain for military service. All of which was illegal, but of course officers of the law are allowed to violate the law, providing they do not allow anybody else to violate it. I wrote a letter to the Local Board, called

their attention to the illegality of their procedure, explained that I was under the jurisdiction of the Federal Court, and could not, in justice to my bondsmen, respond to the unlawful summons of the Local Board. In telephone conversation, members of the Local Board admitted to me certain irregularities, but said that their action would stand and that I must appear for entrainment on the morning of May 20, 1918. The irregularities that they admitted were that, although their procedure was, according to what I declared, contrary to the Selective Service Regulations, they had been instructed by the U. S. District Attorney to pursue the course that they were pursuing; moreover, that, although the summons that they sent me did not state the truth in reciting that I had submitted myself to a Local Board for military service, it was the only kind of a summons that they had so I would have to be content with it.

I again notified the members of the Local Board on the morning of May 20th that I would not respond to their call, and set forth the reasons. After the train left for Fort Logan with the others drafted at the same time that I was drafted, I sent a special messenger to the Office of the Chief of Police and to the office of the members of the Local Board telling them just where I could be found in case they wished to apprehend me. This procedure in order that it could not later be claimed that I was trying to evade the issue.

On the afternoon of May 20th, 1918, I was arrested in the offices of my attorneys, taken to the city jail, and that evening taken before the Local Board, tried, found guilty of deserting the army -- although I had never been in the army for even one second's time -- turned over to the military authorities, placed in solitary confinement in the guard house at Fort Logan, Colorado, on the night of May 20, 1918.

On the morning of May 21, 1918, I was taken before the post commander, attempted to explain my unlawful induction, but he would not listen, his only insistence was that I tell him whether I was willing to become a soldier. Answering negatively, he ordered me returned to the guard house, where I was later ordered to don a suit of overalls and go out to work. Since I refused to join the army, I could not consistently perform work that would be in support of the army post, so I refused to obey the order to go to work. Thereupon three burly soldier lads were brought in, I was again ordered to put on the overalls and go out to work, I again refused. The biggest of the three -- a man who could likely kill me with one good blow -- drew back his fist and shouted: "Put on the overalls before I bust you in the jaw." I looked him square in the eye and said NO! He did not "bust me in the jaw" but all three soldiers proceeded to take my bed and all belongings out of my cell, I was then refused food and water, although late in the afternoon they gave me a drink of water. Too, I had had meals previous to this attempt to intimidate me, so I was not suffering for want of food, although they assured me that I would get nothing to eat until I went to work.

On the evening of May 21, 1918, I was handcuffed to an armed guard, while another armed guard accompanied both of us, all three went to the mess hall, sat down for supper. A gang of raw recruits gathered around and began to shout -- not in loud tones, but all too plainly for me -- "Get a rope, get a rope." I remembered reading in the papers that, "it was a good thing that Salmon did not report for entrainment, because the lads who were loyal to their government were prepared to tie him to the end of the Rio Grande train, with rope around his neck, and have the train drag him out to Fort Logan." The newspapers worked these innocent lads up to such a pitch that they felt that they would be performing a great service for humanity if they would dispose of me. So, as this "get a rope" talk persisted in the mess hall, and knowing that an order to desist would mean nothing to undisciplined recruits, I sort of lost my appetite and told the guards in charge that I had had enough to eat. As we departed from the mess hall, these excited saviors of their country gathered closer and closer, but, no harm befell me.

We boarded the train, started for I did not know where. Passing through Denver. I asked permission to telephone to my wife and mother, and as we had two hours to wait for the outgoing train, I wanted to have a little visit with them, have them come down to the depot. The guard in charge asked me how long it would take them to come from home to the depot. I told him twenty minutes. So, he allowed me to telephone, but not until about eight minutes before the train left in order to make sure that my wife and mother could not see us before leaving.

Placed in the guard house at Camp Funston, Kansas, on the afternoon of May 22, 1918. The first sight that greeted me was a prostrate young man lying on his bed with the upper part of his body streaming with blood, his inner and outer shirt and coat soaked with blood. I learned that he had been beaten almost to death by a guard on the day previously, because he had refused to work. Said guard was promoted to corporal. I got all the facts in the case, corroborated them by questioning of various witnesses, wrote the case up, sent a letter to President Wilson, smuggled the letter out of the guard house. The incidents are numerous, and perhaps irrelevant, but I want to say that the assault on Ralph Hunt -- who was a religious objector to war, a Seventh Day Adventist -- the fact that no medical attention was given him until the second day after the assault, and the various humiliations and sufferings that he was subjected to in the meantime, did not reflect much credit upon those who were supposed to be fighting against such outrageous conduct on the part of the Germans. My letter to President Wilson was caught before it got out of camp, because I was green at the game and made the mistake of addressing it to Mr. Wilson in place of sending it to some friend for remailing. I was threatened with ten days on bread and water for having violated the prison rules which require that all mail be censored but the officers became so frightened that the news of the assault on Hunt would get out that they actually begged me not to write about it again, and Hunt was released.

I was reliably informed at Fort Leavenworth that, after Hunt's release from the guard house at Camp Funston, he was arrested, and, with his mother, confined in the insane asylum at Pueblo, Colorado. Perfectly appropriate in a Democracy of the American brand to put in an insane asylum those who follow Christ's teachings against war! Quite possible that Ralph Hunt actually became insane, he was beaten badly enough to drive almost anybody insane. I know nothing about his mother. This insanity story may be false, but, my informant was a reliable person who claimed that he received letters from Hunt written in the Pueblo insane asylum. But, one can never trust second-hand information, so I do not vouch for the statement that Hunt was put in the asylum.

On or about June 2, 1918, I was presented with a charge sheet, charging me with desertion from the army, notifying me that I would be tried by general court-martial. Obtained permission to act as my own counsel, prepared the case. In conversation with a certain officer, he told me in response to my declaration that the army courts-martial manual clearly proved my detention illegal: "The courts-martial manual is an instrument for official convenience only; when it will help us to convict, we use it, but when it interferes with our game, we ignore it."

Apparently admitting that they were without jurisdiction, indictment against me was quashed, I was released from the guard house on June 10, 1918, not tried by court-martial. I was told to remain in Camp until they could find out what to do with me. During my stay in the guard house -- between May 22 and June 10 -- numerous efforts were made to compel me to go to work. At one time they threatened to put me in irons for my refusal to go to work, but the officer who had issued the order rescinded it after I had discussed the matter with him quite fully. Living conditions in the guard house were quite bad, vainly tried to remedy them while there, and when I got out I went direct to the headquarters of General Wood, lodged my complaint with his Chief or Adjutant or whatever he is termed in army parlance, and told him that if conditions were not improved in that guard house I would write the matter up and give it to the press. I later learned that affairs were straightened out, but of course it was only temporary, and the sum total of my complaint is that it only embittered army officers against me.

On June 12, 1918, I was transferred to Camp Pawnee, Kansas, where I remained until July 2, 1918, when sent to Camp Dodge, Iowa, to appear before what is known as The Mack Board, for examination as to my sincerity as a conscientious objector. Judge Mack finally asked me: "If we have your sentence in the Denver county jail remitted, will you accept a farm furlough?" I told him no, that, I would accept nothing directed by the military authorities. Had I been a coward or a slacker, work on a civilian farm during the war was an easy avenue of escape. This was offered after I had refused every form of non-combatant service.

July 6, 1918, put in guard house at Camp Dodge, Iowa, charged with desertion from the army, propaganda, and disrespect toward an officer.

Was tried on July 24th and July 26th, 1918, by general court-martial. Had sought permission before my trial, and on the first day of the trial, to communicate with my attorneys by telephone, agreed to pay the cost of 'phoning and to permit the censor to listen to our conversation. Not allowed to thus communicate with my attorneys, impossible to communicate with them otherwise in so short a period.

At my trial, I was my own counsel, cited seventeen different instances of lack of jurisdiction from the manual for courts-martial, any one of which was sufficient to prevent my trial by a military tribunal provided the military authorities respected their own laws. Among these citations was the fact that Section One of the Manual, in light of Rule XIII of the Selective Service Regulations, prohibited my trial by a military court. Concerning Rule XIII, the Judge Advocate General at Washington, D. C., issued a ruling on July 11, 1918, -- thirteen days before my trial began -- in which he construed Rule XIII to prohibit the trial by military court of any person who was as in my case, at large on bail under criminal process. I have not quoted his exact words, but have stated the substance. Despite this ruling -- the ruling did not mention military court, but stated that such an one as myself who was at large on bail, would not be called by the Local Board, and therefore, according to the court-martial manual, would not be subject to military jurisdiction -- so, as I was stating, despite this ruling, the Camp Dodge court-martial proceeded to try me. Another point: the manual for courts-martial provides that, if an accused is not brought to trial within a maximum of forty-eight days, his arrest shall cease. I was not brought to trial until the sixty-fifth day, and, during my trial, the trial judge advocate did his utmost to prevent my presentation of the case. Ignoring everything but their determination to try me by court-martial, they presented their case. I was found not-guilty of disrespect toward an officer, guilty of desertion from the army and propaganda. I was never in the army for a single second's time, yet I was adjudged guilty of deserting it. The propaganda that I engaged in was showing a copy of a letter that I had written to President Wilson to some fellow conscientious objectors, and leaving several of them keep copies of it. These conscientious objectors could not be influenced by me, for they had taken a firm stand against service long before they ever met me, their ancestors for hundreds of years back had refused military service in several foreign countries, they belonged to a religious sect known as The Hutterian Brethren.

In a recent letter from Captain C. H. Richardson, formerly of Camp Dodge, Iowa, which letter he gave me permission to publish, Captain Richardson said in part: "Anybody that had a chance to read your proceedings knows that you were framed-up on. It's deals like the military authorities gave you that has made

hundreds of thousands of boys that were soldiers in this war hate things military like men do rattle-snakes ... If the officers sitting on that court-martial at Camp Dodge gave you the same rights that they demand for themselves, your case would have been thrown out of court the same as it was at Camp Funston."

In place of getting the "rights" that Captain Richardson speaks of, I got 25 years at hard labor in the military prison at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

On September 5, 1918, while still awaiting transfer to Fort Leavenworth, I was called to headquarters, the following proposal was made to me: "If you will accept service, you will be made a first-class sergeant in the 19th Train Headquarters, your 25 year sentence will be remitted, you will be able to start with a clean record in the army, you will be a clerk to the Adjutant which is non-combatant service. Will you accept?" I explained the impossibility of acceptance. It was not an easy matter to decline, for I was needed at home, that is my help was needed, and I certainly could not help while in prison. My wife was in the hospital, her letters appealing to me to accept service, baby Charles was born the following day. In addition to wife and child, my widowed-mother needed support. Yet I am branded a coward for choosing 25 years in prison in preference to this easy job in the army. As I am now in an insane asylum -- without having been examined for my sanity -- I suppose I have graduated from the class of cowards to that of lunatics. Even conscientious objectors do progress!

On my first wedding anniversary, October 9, 1918, I arrived at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, and was clothed in the garb of a felon.

I went to work in the guard house the day that my sentence was approved -- August 10th. I had always declared that, if sentenced, I would then go to work and do as my sentence required of me. So, at Fort Leavenworth, I continued to follow out that policy. Soon though, it became manifest that I erred, that I should not work in a military prison even though I was found guilty of violating the laws of the land. To work in a military prison was to aid the killing machine. So, I quit work on December 1, 1918. This action made me a candidate for the dungeon, but for some reason I was not put down the hole. I made good use of my time by organizing a strike among the prisoners, a strike against unjust prison conditions, etc. The mess fund was being robbed of \$700.00 per day, and the whole prison population of more than 3,000 prisoners were suffering as a consequence. This mess fund robbery was of course only one of the grievances, but I made it a big point in my agitation for a strike. What prisoners term "rats" squealed on me, I was called to the executive office and questioned about the strike, then put down the hole on bread and water. The strike failed to come off on

the appointed day, but the leaven was working, other prisoners kept up the agitation, and six weeks later the entire prison body refused to work any longer. All demands were granted, the strike was won in less than three days.

Col. Rice, commandant of the prison, threatened to try me by general court-martial for lying about the mess-fund, said that my statements that the mess-fund was being robbed of \$700.00 a day were false, and, as I had smuggled letters out with such information in them for purposes of publication, he said that he would give me a chance to prove my charges by forcing me to trial. I thanked him for this opportunity. But, when I got my charge sheet, I was indicted for organizing a strike and for causing a riot in the mess-hall. For some reason he had the mess-fund robbery left out. The court-martial was ready, I was to be tried on a Monday afternoon, the judge advocate was going over the case with me on the Thursday previous. I insisted on bringing in the \$700.00 per day mess-fund robbery, because, as I pointed out, that was one of my principal motives in organizing a strike of the prisoners. For some reason the charges were dropped, I was never tried. But I was kept down the hole for four and a half months. When I got out I was nearly dead, the bad air played havoc with me. Many times I was offered a release from the hole if I would go to work. But my no-work stand was final, I would die in the dungeon before I would go to work. About the middle of April, 1919, I was offered a release from prison within 90 days if I would go to work for that time. I told the Colonel that if I would be released the next day by working just five minutes, I would not work that five minutes. It was not a case of stubbornness, but if I could work five minutes I could work a day, and if I could work a day, I could work a year, and if I could work a year I could join the army, especially I could very easily take non-combatant service. So, back to the hole I went with my 25 years still hanging on. The latter part of the same month I received word that my sentence had been reduced to five years.

On April 29, 1919, I was taken out of the hole, put over in an open-air cantonment with the other conscientious objectors. Thirteen days later, we were put down into the sub-basement of the fourth wing of the prison, and Col. Rice came down and told us that, unless we would go to work, we would serve the remainder of our sentences in that sub-basement. The air was foul and damp, we asked every day for permission to go out of doors for an hour's exercise, but each day the request was denied. The only way that we could get a little fresh air and sunshine was to compromise and go to work, this we would not do.

June 20, 1919, we were transferred to the Post guard house, and the following day were sent to Fort Douglas, Utah, arriving there on June 23, 1919. At Fort Douglas, several of the boys suggested that we volunteer to do our own cooking. All except one agreed. The one exception was Jacob W. Rose. So, the rest of us did Rose's cooking for him. At the time, I thought that it was not right to do our cooking, but I cast the thought aside

after reflecting that the cooking that we would do would be for ourselves only. The work was then divided, and I fell to the lot of doing kitchen work and getting coal for the stove.

On August 19, 1919, the 142 conscientious objectors (C.O.s) at Fort Douglas, Utah, were lined up in the prison yard, and Col. Graham came to us, ordered us to go to work, told us that those who refused would be punished in various ways, that the authorities had the "whip handle" of the situation, that among other things we would likely be court-martialled if we did not do as we were ordered to do. Seven or eight obeyed orders, the remainder of the 142 were put on bread and water for fourteen days. A few weeks before this, Col. Byram, commandant of the prison, told me that if I did not go to work I would be tried by court-martial over and over again and kept in prison for the remainder of my life. I told him that he had my permission to have me tried by court-martial immediately and give me a million years in sentences but that I would not go to work. I was not tried.

On August 19, 1919, one of our group, Howard Moore, was put in the guard house for refusal to obey military orders, brutally beaten about the head, face and chest by Sergeant Brundt. Brundt's attack was so vicious that he broke one of the fingers on his (Brundt's) right hand. Moore was let out of the guard house the next day and put on bread and water for fourteen days with the rest of us.

We were given every assurance at Fort Douglas that, if we would go to work, we would be released within a short time, authorities at Washington even went so far as to intimate that it would be but a matter of two weeks until we were released if we would work, and the work was easy. Some of the boys broke and went to work, some got out in two weeks, some had to wait three and four and five weeks. There were only a few of the absolutists though that went to work, about fourteen out of 142. The others who consented to work, had worked at Fort Leavenworth up to the time they were sent to Fort Douglas. It seems that the authorities thought that, by mixing the non-workers with the workers, the former might be persuaded to go to work. It may seem queer that there were two groups of C.O.s, the workers and the non-workers, but it is easily understood when you consider that some C.O.s took non-combatant service, while others chose prison.

We were subjected to numerous petty persecutions at Fort Douglas. For ten weeks my brother, who lives just a few miles from the prison, was not allowed to visit me. He kept on trying, and after ten weeks was finally allowed to visit me for one hour in the presence of Col. Graham. Murderers are allowed visitors, but because I had refused to kill or help to kill, I was not permitted to see my own relatives. Numerous friends called, not any of them allowed to see me. Same with the other C.O.s.

One of our number, Frank Burke, took sick shortly after

arriving at Fort Douglas. At the hospital he was told: "If you were not a CO you would get decent treatment." Lack of medical attention indirectly caused his death two days later. I visited him in the hospital just a few hours before he died, he was in terrible agony. We tried to get a civilian physician so that he would get proper treatment, but the local authorities would not permit this action. Just here I might observe that, although the C.O.s were branded as being afraid of their lives, it was a well known fact that the safest place for the man afraid to fight was in the army. The death rate in our ranks was four times greater -- that is, the percentage of deaths in the ranks of the C.O.s was four times greater-- than in the army. All through our camp and prison life, it was easy to observe that the road we were traveling was by far the most precarious. And, if we were looking for the easy way out, it was not hard to find. Each day of our confinement was filled with alluring promises of immunity, and the promises were not the kind that are unfulfilled, for occasionally the ranks would break and one or two would filter through and receive the reward of the compromiser.

Personally, I had it comparatively easy, although I am glad that it was not any harder than it was, and I would very much dislike to have to go through again what I have gone through the past twenty six months. Still, I had it quite comfortable as compared with some of my comrades. John Kos has sixty scars on his body, to remind him of the sixty thrusts of the bayonet that greeted his refusal to work. Breger, Hennessy and Kaplan were hung by the neck until almost dead, cut down just in time to save their lives, then hung again with the rope around their shoulders and there left suspended until in Hennessy's case -- I do not know for certain about the other two -- but in Hennessy's case, his fingers were paralyzed before the rope was cut and the blood allowed to circulate properly. Starvation, beatings, cold baths in zero weather, bayoneting, were the order of the day. Every method of torture was used, and while many died, only a few were broken. Shackled to the bars of their cells for nine hours a day in cold, dark cells, fed only bread and water for fourteen days at a time, but shackled every day for thirty, forty, fifty and more days, such was the lot of a great number in our group. I believe Shotkin was strung-up for nearly sixty days.

Getting back to Fort Douglas: Another of the punishments meted out to us for refusal to obey the August 19, 1919, order to go to work, was the loss of good time. In my case that meant an additional sentence -- or what was equivalent to an additional sentence -- of eighteen months. A man with a two year's sentence, had six months added to the time that he would have otherwise had to serve. Many of the two year boys have served their additional six months and have been released. But, consider the injustice of virtually resentencing a man because he refused to do that for which he was originally sent to prison!

Time rolled on at Fort Douglas. As I previously

stated, we were subjected to many petty persecutions, but I must not waste time enumerating them. I have now reached the date of April 26, 1920. I wrote a letter to Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker, informing him that I could not longer volunteer to do the work incidental to the preparing of my own meals. I am sorry that I cannot quote the letter word for word, but everything that I had was taken from me at Fort Douglas -- that is, withheld from me -- when I was sent to this insane asylum, and I can now give you only the substance of the letter. I explained to Mr. Baker how I had volunteered to do this work, but that time and calm reflection had convinced me that, even though my intentions were good, I erred in thus volunteering to do anything that would assist the military authorities in their custody of my person, and that I therefore must discontinue my volunteer services. A certain prisoner filled the breach, did the work that I previously had done. I could say nothing for or against this prisoner's action, although I made it clear that I would not do that if I were in his place and he in mine. This prisoner was released from prison on July 12, as his sentence expired on that date.

July 13, 1920, I was issued raw rations, told that I must either cook the food myself or eat it raw. I would do neither. I went on a hunger strike, demanded that I be given prepared food to eat. Two days passed by without my being given prepared food, I was put in the guard house on July 14th, and while reflecting upon the logic of the C.O.s stand, I was compelled to admit that, to be consistent, I should not eat the food even though they brought me prepared food. Incidentally, the guard house is an unhealthful place, air is bad due to poor circulation which is the result of having windows close to the ceiling in place of near the center of the walls as in ordinary dwellings. For three days the guard house was locked day and night, I was the sole occupant, the heat was oppressive, the air was stifling. The fourth day they began to leave the door open all day, which made it more tolerable during the day, but the nights were still quite bad, and nights remained so, for repeated requests that the door be left open at night were ignored. Captain Walters said that I would not be guarded if the door were left open at night. I reminded him that guarding in my case was purely perfunctory, that he knew just as well as I knew that I and any other C.O. could escape any time that we wanted to escape, but, as escape would be running away from our fight, and as we are not that kind of quitters, we would stick around until released in the proper manner. Commenting upon the heat of the guard house, one of the sergeants on guard said: "You sure chose the wrong time of the year to get in this guard house." I was there for eleven days without food, had been one day without food before being confined in the guard house.

The Fort Douglas authorities did their utmost to keep news of my hunger strike from reaching the outside world. On July 17, 1920, I had written to Secretary Baker, Col. Goodale and Captain Walters -- a joint letter -- informing them that I was on a liberty or death hunger strike. Unfairness on the part of the

Fort Douglas officials prevents me from quoting the aforementioned July 17th letter in full. I will give the substance of it. I told the addressed that, two days previously I had requested Captain Walters, verbally, to inform his superiors that I was on a liberty or death hunger strike, that I was now informing each of them by letter; I explained that the reason for my hunger strike was in order that I would not longer aid my imprisonment by eating their food, for my imprisonment served as a warning to all those who would dare to oppose American militarism. I explained that my motive was not suicide, that if I died they would be committing murder, for I was unjustly imprisoned, had done nothing wrong, should not be held, and if held and starved they would be responsible for my death. I explained my reasons for opposition to war, religious, humanitarian, political, and called attention to the practicability of the C.O. stand in the light of the World War's eventualities. I will again touch upon these matters in my explanation of why I am a C.O., which will follow shortly, therefore, I need not amplify here.

I attempted to send five telegrams to friends and my attorney, notifying them that I was on a liberty or death hunger strike. Local authorities would not allow the telegrams to go forward. Various other prisoners wrote about my hunger strike in letters home, the letters were returned to the prisoners with the information that news about my strike would not be allowed to go forward. Briefly, everything was done to prevent us from getting news to the outside world. Had I died in the meantime, I suppose death would have been due to some unknown cause.

On the tenth day of my hunger strike, four telegrams were received, three addressed to me, one to Wm. Nye Doty. The news was out and information was sought. The authorities were furious! Their plans of secrecy having been foiled they knew not what to do, at least such appeared to be their attitude.

The telegram to Doty, from Theodore H. Lunde of Chicago, stated that he was reliably informed that Salmon was on a hunger strike and he wanted full details by telegraph. The telegrams to me were from my dear mother and two friends, Barney Haughey and Theo. Lunde, the friends urging me to stop the hunger strike and my mother's appeal reading thusly: "Ben my heart is breaking. I am coming, for God's sake live until I see you." I burst into tears, it is so hard to cause pain to a loving mother. I would give my life willingly for my mother, but now she was asking me to live for her and I could not comply with her request. So, as I stated in my letter of July 17th, everything was in the hands of God and there I left it, leaving to Him whether I should live until mother saw me.

The eighth or ninth day of my hunger strike -- it was the eighth day -- Col. Loving, chief of the medical staff, after a long conversation with me said: "Well, you're up against it, you know what I mean; and the best thing you can do is to change your

mind and jump in and help those who are defending the weak against the strong." I replied: "Col. Loving, that is just what I am doing 'helping those who are defending the weak against the strong.'" Translated into the English language, Col. Loving's remarks just quoted, and which were his concluding remarks upon leaving the guard house, meant: You cannot get the news out, we're going to let you die, you had better change your mind.

Believing that I was near death, I sent for a Catholic priest. They let him come, for it seems that they felt that he was their ally. He stopped at headquarters, was given his lesson, came down to see me. Father Hogan asked me what the trouble was, I explained. He assured me that I was all wrong and gave me a long argument. I will quote his remarks presently, but to avoid duplication I must leave them out here, as they will properly fit in later on. For the present though, I wish to state that he became slightly perturbed when I accused him of being a representative of the killing machine, and he said: "Why did you send for me?" I told him: "Father, I sent for you as a Catholic priest to minister unto me spiritually, and not as an agent for the military authorities." Father Hogan denied me the last sacraments, but said he would have another priest come to see me so that I could go to confession and receive Holy Communion. I told him that, if I could receive Holy Communion, I should be allowed to receive the last sacraments, the sacraments for the dying. But he countered that he knew that he was doing the proper thing in refusing me under the circumstances. Father Hogan claimed that my hunger strike was suicide, although he claimed that the Irish hunger strikers -- many of whom died -- did not commit suicide. Shortly, I will recite his logic or lack of logic. As a priest, I respect Father Hogan with all the ardor of my Catholic heart. But, as I told him, he should not help out the wholesale murderers by coming to me and attempting to change my attitude. I do not object to any person trying to show me where he thinks I am in error, but Father Hogan knew, or ought to know, the psychological effect, detrimental to me, that his persuasion would have upon the minds of the military authorities who were trying to crush my spirit, and, therefore, it seemed to me, and I so informed Father Hogan, that, when I send for him as a priest, he should come as a priest and not as an agent of the military authorities. I really regret that I had to speak to Father Hogan as I did, nor would I write concerning him, were it not that I want it known that a mistaken though well meaning clergy cannot dissuade me from the course that, as you will soon see, is dictated by sound logic, by adherence to principles consistent with Christianity. Father Hogan is a holy man, a good priest, he has made and is making many sacrifices for humanity. May God reward him for the good that he has done, and may He enable him to see that the duty of a Christian is to oppose militarism by word and example.

On July 25th, 1920, the 12th day of my hunger strike, I was transferred from the guard house to the prisoners ward in the

hospital at Fort Douglas, where my dear mother, brother and his fiancee Miss McLane visited me. Were it not for my mother's coming from Denver to see me, and the fact that the newspapers published an interview with her, it is doubtful whether I would have been removed from the guard house to the hospital. If the guard house were a fit place, why change me?

I was in the cell room about ten minutes when the aforementioned visitors were ushered into my room. Every courtesy was shown to them and to me. A delicious dinner was brought to me, fried eggs, ham, toast, bread and butter, milk, fruit. Doctor Washburn -- who was very gentlemanly throughout our acquaintance -- asked me to eat and build up the strength that I had lost. I did not touch the food, explained to him that I was on a liberty or death hunger strike. After the visitors left, a nice supper was brought up to me, and the untouched dinner was taken away. The supper remained uneaten, it was later removed from the room. An enticing breakfast was laid before me the next morning, only to be taken away about thirty minutes later since it was seen that I would not eat.

It was now July 26, 1920, the 13th day of my hunger strike. Dr. Mason examined my teeth. He discovered a wisdom tooth arrested in growth, took an Xray picture of it, and suggested that he extract the tooth because it might be preventing me from thinking clearly, said that after the tooth was out I might see things differently. I thanked him for the suggestion; told him that as soon as released I would go to a civilian dentist and have the tooth extracted, although I assured him that such procedure would not alter the rules of logic or change principles in any way. Immediately I sensed a plot to send me to the insane asylum, and my guess was correct.

At about ten o' clock of the same day, July 26, Dr. Washburn came to my cell room with three assistants, prepared to forcibly feed me a pint of milk. As I had previously promised him that I would offer a minimum amount of resistance, in conformity with my non-resistance attitude, it seemed strange that he brought so many assistants. He had a porcelain funnel. I told him that he had best get a tube as I would not swallow the milk, but he knew better. The funnel was put into my mouth, Dr. Washburn held my nose so that I was forced to breathe through my mouth, and as the milk was poured into my mouth through the funnel it ran down my throat while I breathed. So, I had to swallow the milk. At first I tried to get Dr. Washburn's hand away from my nose so that I could breathe through my nose, but one guard held one hand, the other guard held the other hand. I immediately discovered that, by trying to take away Dr. Washburn's hand I was not offering the minimum amount of resistance, so afterwards when he took hold of my nose and shut off breathing I did not resist. Each time he asked me if I would drink the milk without his holding my nose, but I told him that if I could breathe through my nose I would not swallow the milk and it would run out of my mouth. So, to make certain, he always held my nose.

Beginning with the forcible feeding that I have just mentioned, I was fed in that manner twice daily until I reached Washington, D.C., with the exception of the last day of my journey upon which I was fed only once.

On Tuesday, July 27, my mother called to see me, but she was not allowed to come up to my room. I was informed that she was told that she could not see me because I needed perfect rest and quiet.

On Wednesday, July 28, the 15th day of my hunger strike, I was told to put on my clothes, they let me have my razor with which to shave, said I was going to be taken out for a little walk in the sunshine, that the sunshine would do me good. So, about three o'clock Dr. Washburn accompanied me on the stroll for a little sunshine. I knew that something was in the air, at least I felt it, but said nothing. We reached Col. Loving's house, sat on the front porch for about five minutes, then a big military touring car was driven up to the front of the residence. Two armed guards, Lt. Col's., Goodale and Loving, the chauffeur and myself being seated in the car it started speeding westward. On our way, we were met by another group in another military auto, the officers stepped out, got our transportation and speeded onward. We arrived in Ogden, Utah, 46 miles distant, within about an hour. While waiting for the train, Captain Lang, the chauffeur, said: "Do you know where you are going to Salmon?" I told him I did not know but that I believed I was going to Washington. "What makes you think that you are going to Washington?" asked Captain Lang. I told him that we were going east, as I had heard Col. Goodale speak about the berths for Chicago, and that I merely surmised we were going to Washington. Although I did not tell Captain Lang at the time, I surmised that I was being taken to the insane asylum, because I know the tricks of the military authorities whenever they find that they cannot break a man's spirit, and I had not failed to consider Dr. Mason's remarks about that wisdom tooth that he had taken an Xray picture of.

I needed "perfect rest and quiet" when my good mother wanted to see me on Tuesday, July 27th. But, on Wednesday, July 28th, when I was still weaker from the hunger strike, it was O.K. to hustle me off on a trip of approximately 2,500 miles without letting me know where I was being taken to. When one is accompanied by two armed guards and by two Lt-Colonels -- four in all -- and speeded past Salt Lake City a distance of 46 miles in order to catch a train that could have been taken at Salt Lake City more conveniently, and when one is kept in ignorance as to his destination except for what guesses he can make, does it seem that Col. Loving was sincere in telling my mother that the reason he would not let her visit me was because I "needed perfect rest and quiet." Col. Loving, chief medical officer, must have known the day before that he was going to take me on a long trip, and it appears that the reason he did not let my dear mother see me, although she traveled all the way from Denver to see me, was because he

had something to conceal. If he had had nothing to conceal, why was my transfer from Fort Douglas Hospital to the train for Washington clothed in secrecy?

Corporals Brown and Brotton, who were my guards on the trip, were kind and considerate. The first night out I was allowed to sleep alone, but Col. Goodale must have become frightened because the second and third nights of the trip he ordered me handcuffed to one of the guards while sleeping. I could hardly sleep in this fashion, which made the trip rather uncomfortable. We were on the road 75 hours from the time of leaving the hospital at Fort Douglas until reaching the station in Washington, D.C. We were met in Washington by Col. Penn, and by those in charge of the ambulance. Col. Penn did not speak to me, it was unnecessary for Col. Goodale could tell him everything. What matter if some of Col. Goodale's statements were colored with bias? Wasn't he a military man, and wasn't I only a slacker and a coward? No, Col. Penn, Washington's representative, did not need to hear my side of the story. We arrived in Washington at 6:30 P.M., Saturday, July 31, 1920, the 18th day of my hunger strike. The quart of milk put into my stomach that morning in the usual manner, was the last nourishment that I had received, and was to be the last until Monday afternoon, a lapse of fifty-six hours.

Arriving at the insane asylum known as St. Elizabeth's Hospital at about 7:30 P.M., I was turned over to the clerk in charge as a "patient." Col. Loving handed the clerk "a history of the case." What the "history" contained I do not know, but military men are never biased and they adhere strictly to the truth, so I must believe that the "history" could not have contained the slightest shade of prejudicial reasoning.

I was given a bath, a change of clothes, then consigned to the ward for the criminally insane, that section of the insane asylum reserved for the worst that society produces. I was not examined before coming here to determine my sanity. Wasn't the fact that I would not slaughter my fellow man at the behest of the profiteers who control our government sufficient evidence of insanity? Or, if that testimony was insufficient, was not my refusal to eat conclusive? Col. Loving and Col. Goodale are not the only ones who have unofficially declared me insane, so I must not be harsh with them. Every person who differs with me to any great extent politically, and those -- at least many of those -- who differ with my religious views, and many of my own church members, who have watched my attitude on the question of Christianity vs. Militarism will agree with our good friends Loving and Goodale that the ward for the criminally insane is the place that was made for me. Col. Loving and Col. Goodale, if I were a soldier, I would salute you twice for every one time that you saluted me in return, for you have certainly executed a most remarkable piece of stratagem! Putting me in an insane asylum without even a kangaroo court trial to determine my sanity. I'll say that is clever work.

At least from the viewpoint of those who differ with my stand against war and military preparation against war, my present environment is quite suitable to one in such a state of mind. Here, my associates and myself agree in at least one thing, that is: each one of us thinks that all the others are crazy. I ambled around in the court yard the morning after my first night in this disinteresting hotel, -- no, I didn't go very fast, but I plugged along at a fairly good gait considering the circumstances, for I needed loosening up -- and my associates eyed me queerly and even sadly as they reflected that I might have amounted to something in this world if I had not lost my mind. One colored gentleman came up to me and asked me when I got here. I told him. "Yes," he said, "you're just the fellow I've been looking for." He then assumed a fighting posture, asked me if I was from Jackson, Miss., and as I assured him that I was not, I prepared to retreat gracefully, but not too hurriedly else I might cause him to decide that a sudden lunge in my direction was necessary to avoid a calamity. I got out of his way, up the stairs, made up my mind that I would keep a safe distance from crazy people from then on. And I haven't the least doubt in the world but that he too thought that his life would be happier if he were not always bumping into crazy people.

The wilder ones rave and holler, all day long they rant and screech, sometimes in stentorian tones, sometimes a little milder but only when they become exhausted do they consent to use a little judgment. Oh, it is delightful! And the language -- well, it is not the kind that one is accustomed to hearing in polite society. At night everything is perfectly quiet except for the intermittent ravings of various unfortunates and the innocent conversations of those who seem to have many friends conversing with them in the solitary cells. I suppose they often talk about me and Col. Goodale and Col. Loving, wondering if we three will ever get normal again.

There are many here of apparently normal mentality. They have been here for some time, it is said that some of them were not quite so well when they came. All of which gives me hope that I too may yet come out of it. Quite a number are here because they "bumped somebody off." They are the murderers, sane in every respect except that at one time, in a moment of insanity, they killed somebody. I think that I belong in their class, that is, I seem to be sane in every respect except that at one time, in a moment of insanity, I refused to kill. We happen to have pursued different courses, but we were going in the same direction, viz: St. Elizabeth's insane asylum.

Yes, I am living in a group whose characteristics are quite homogeneous, yet it is such a heterogeneous gathering that one is reminded of the saying that it takes all kinds of people to make a world and God did not forget any of them. I must confess that the mental atmosphere is not very refreshing. It is such a treat to converse with the guards and the doctors, for, somehow I feel that when I am talking to them or to some of the prisoners who are considered normal that, I am talking to really

sane persons, but then the thought occurs to me "I wonder if they really believe that I am bugs?" Well, whether I am sane or insane, I will now proceed to present the logic of my stand as a conscientious objector to war upon religious, humanitarian and political grounds; and, I will also present the logic of carrying this C.O. stand to the point of a liberty or death hunger strike. But, before going further, I want to say that the guards and the doctors at St. Elizabeth's have been quite good to me, they have shown every consideration within their power, they treat me, they treat all the prisoners, in a kindly, gentlemanly manner, they seem to take an interest in the patients and not merely to draw their salary, they try to help all those under their charge, of course keeping within the necessary limits.

There are many tests that a stand such as the one that I have taken, must stand. These tests are so numerous that, it were impossible to enumerate them in a disquisition confined to the limits within which what I am writing must be kept. For one thing, my strength is waning rapidly, in place of growing stronger daily or retaining the little strength that I have left, I often feel that I am steadily on the decline, and I must therefore avoid overtaking the small store of energy still on deposit. I will however, relate essentials, and from the essentials that I offer for your consideration, I am certain that any extreme to which you wish to carry the investigation, will only carry you further on the road of agreement with the stand of a conscientious objector.

I believe that the first question to be disposed of is: Why have I acted contrary to the wishes of society? Why have I persisted in a course of action frowned upon by such a vast majority of people?

An indictment of my attitude is found in Wilfrid Lay's popular exposition of psychoanalysis, which indictment I believe expresses the opinion of a great many minds. Says Lay: "When you are in Rome, do as the Romans do, is an adage that calls for the complete harmonizing of the individual with his environment. There ought really to be nothing in our lives that we should not be eager to do, just as our fellows do it, if not even a little better, or more enthusiastically. To live among people and continually to refuse to do the things that the people all around us are doing is a restriction upon ourselves that has been placed upon us by the independent activity of our complexes, developing as they do in the depths of our Unconscious, and differs only in degree from the well developed and organized phobias that have been mentioned above. Disinclinations are little phobias; acceptance and acquiescence are normal healthy states of mind. Rejections and refusals and declinings are unhealthy, abnormal states of mind, for they imply a lack of power to cope with the situations rejected or dodged, and an unconscious belief on the part of the declining person that his constitution, mental or physical, is not strong enough to stand the strain." I believe that Dr. Lay's statement just quoted, fairly states the case of the anti-conscientious objector. We will now examine the logic

of Dr. Lay's statement. One thing is certain; what he says must be true or false, and I believe that it can be shown very simply that it is either one or the other. He says: "There ought really to be nothing in our lives that we should not be eager to do, just as our fellows do it." Our fellows went to war, why not the C.O.? Again Dr. Lay says: "When you are in Rome, do as the Romans do."

Suppose the scientists did things just as their fellows did them? Would there be any progress in science? Suppose those interested in transportation, transported goods only in the manner that their fellows transported goods, would we today have the locomotive in place of the ox cart? Suppose Christ did just as the pagan Romans, would we today have any Christianity?

Dr. Lay is quite a believer in the Freudian theory of psychoanalysis, The Freudians are in disagreement with many others in their branch of science. In other words, the Freudians are not doing things -- thinking and acting -- just as their fellows are. In the same book from which I quoted the aforementioned argument against the stand of the C.O. and all those who do not do things just as their fellows do, we read the following from the pen of Dr. Lay: "Freud has told the ignorant and the innocent alike, with scientific impartiality, that they are ignorant of what goes on in their Unconscious and why they are ignorant and the results of their ignorance. It is of course not pleasant to learn of any defect in our knowledge, particularly that part of our knowledge which concerns the most personal relations of our ego, and Freud and his followers have been reviled for their truth, even by those who are supposed to be in possession of the calmness and coolness coming from scientific work, with a vehemence which is born only of a strong need for defense. But the Freudians have shown that if we feel strongly that a certain tenet needs vigorous defense we are admitting to ourselves that it is weak and cannot defend itself. Few persons think it necessary to defend what is accepted by many. No one would think of advocating the continuance of breathing, for instance. But if a seer of truths finds his fellows universally indulging in a habit which is both foolish and dangerous, foolish because conditioned by ignorance and dangerous because sapping the vital forces of almost all individuals, more insidious and more unknown than infantile paralysis, but infinitely more widespread, he will be opposed by those who will listen to him and followed by those who understand him."

Dr. Lay has been generous. He furnished the argument that flattened the C.O. out like a griddle cake. Then he shows that, after all, "if we feel strongly that a certain tenet needs vigorous defense" (as the profiteers and the newspapers defend war and military preparation for war) "we are admitting to ourselves that it is weak and cannot defend itself."

Paganism needed vigorous defense, so the Christians were cast to the lions, not because the Christians did anything wrong, but because they conscientiously disbelieved in adoring idols. Militarism needs vigorous defense, so conscientious

objectors are cast into prisons and into insane asylums, not because the C.O.s did anything wrong, but because they disbelieve in paying homage to modern paganism which is personified in the monster Militarism. You will contend that militarism is necessary in order to protect your country. I will answer this argument in its regular order later on. For the present I want to declare that the maxim "When in Rome, do as the Romans do" is not a safe rule of life. It should read: "When in Rome, do as the Romans do if they are doing what is right, but if they are doing what is wrong then do not do as the Romans are doing." The C.O. has good reason to believe that militarists are doing wrong. I will present the reasons.

Before taking up the question of why we are C.O.s, I want to cover another important point, and that point is: "Why do I oppose war when the Catholics are practically unanimous in support of it in such an emergency as that that confronted America in 1917?" I will explain why I oppose war at all times. But first of all, it is unfair to judge my conduct by the conduct of other Catholics, unless you take all factors into consideration. Joan of Arc was burned to death as a heretic by the Catholic hierarchy of her time, but the Catholic hierarchy of the year 1920 canonized her as a saint. It must be particularly difficult for non-Catholics to understand such a paradox. I will not take time to explain it here, but the citation instances the fact that just because the majority of Catholics believe a certain way is no valid reason why I should believe that way. In the Catholic church we are at liberty to hold different views on matters not passed upon ex cathedrally. The Jesuit Order, considered by many to be the greatest -- or at least among the greatest -- of all religious orders in the Catholic church, was suppressed for twenty-five years, but by a Pontiff reigning at a later period restored to the good graces of the Holy See. Not many years ago, Father McGlynn was excommunicated from the priesthood for the advocacy of single tax, (the system of land-value taxation fathered by Henry George) and for six long years, that faithful priest was an outcast. Justice finally dawned, Father McGlynn was reinstated without retracting a single utterance, and he advocated single tax to his dying day which occurred I believe in January, 1900. I am handicapped in giving fuller details concerning the occasions of which I have just written, because all my books -- everything that I had in prison -- was withheld from me when I was secretly taken from Fort Douglas and placed in this insane asylum. But what I have told you is authentic and suffices to prove that in order to be right it is not necessary that I should follow the majority of Catholics or any other majority.

In fact, about the greatest argument against militarism is the fact that the majority support it. Minorities, not majorities, spell progress.

One of the main reasons why I was placed in this insane asylum without a sanity test is that the majority thinks and acts differently than I do. Too, my judgment was considered defective¹, and I suppose a majority thinks that if I refused to eat I must be crazy. Well I think it best to dispose of this

"defective judgment" argument and also the question of being crazy, before I offer my reasons for opposing war and military preparation against war. Because, if you consider my judgment defective, you are less likely to consider my argument seriously. Or, if you believe that my refusal to eat is an indication of insanity, you would discount my remarks accordingly.

Columbus was accused of defective judgment by all who looked upon his expedition as sheer folly. After sailing for days and days with no sight of land but still persisting in sailing on and on, his crew were more certain than those who had stayed at home that Christopher's judgment was defective. John Brown representing the militarist faction, and William Lloyd Garrison representing the pacifist faction of the anti-slavery movement, were looked upon by the great majority of Northerners and Southerners as people whose judgment was defective. George Washington's judgment was considered defective, for he had but few to support him in the beginning, and it is a matter of history that when receiving the greatest support he was upheld by only one-third of the population and by only one business man out of every twenty. William Penn's judgment was considered defective, but his was the only colony that did not suffer any killed or wounded at the hands of the Indians. Colonists surrounding the territory occupied by William Penn and his followers, armed to the teeth and suffered greatly from raids by the Indians who killed their men, captured their women and children, laid waste to their crops, devastated their lands, burned their homes, and left the colonies in desolate ruin. Not so with William Penn and his fellows; they traded with the Indians, did not have a murderous weapon in all the colony, not one of their group was ever attacked by the Indians, and they did not suffer in any manner whatsoever. Such is a matter of history. Now, I do not compare myself with any of those named in this paragraph, but I put my Master, whose teachings I am following, above them. And I have instanced the cases enumerated, merely for the purpose of showing that it is not always those who do as the Romans whose judgment is above question. I will prove to you by the teachings of Jesus Christ that my stand against war is not a case of defective judgment. Yes, Washington succeeded with arms. That is no proof that he would not have succeeded if he did not resort to arms. There are a few -- so very, very few -- instances in history where resort to arms has resulted in ultimate good. It would be a strange thing if some little good did not come out of so much bad. But, to repeat, the exceptional cases of success do not prove that Christ's way would have failed. Christ is God, and God is the supreme personification of practicality and success.

Concerning the question of not eating: There are many who brand me as crazy and as a suicide because I took the hunger strike route. These same people commend the Irish hunger strikers, and they felt that the women suffragists who hunger struck in the very city where I am now confined in an insane asylum, did the proper thing. Those named hunger struck in protest against unjust imprisonment only. My protest is against unjust imprisonment and against being forced to indirectly help militarism by my

continued confinement. By accepting the food that is given to me, I would thereby help to keep myself alive in prison, thus enabling the War Department to use me as a horrible example of what happens to dissenters against American militarism. By a liberty or death hunger strike, I cease to act as a moral agency in support of the killing machine, for if I am liberated I cannot be pointed to as an example, and if they let me starve to death I will, upon my demise, cease to be an example. Of course they could say that those who would follow my example would die in prison, but if they participate in affairs military to any extent they have an excellent chance to cash in. Forceable feeding will prolong my life but will not preserve it indefinitely. I am growing weak, and, ultimately -- in fact before any great length of time -- I will drop off.

Father Hogan of Salt Lake City, Utah, defended the Irish hunger strikers with the greatest zeal, and he condemned my attitude with equal fervor. He squared his reasoning in a very simple manner by merely declaring that they were doing the right thing while I was doing the wrong thing. "You must do as the State tells you" declared Father Hogan. Not if the State tells you to do wrong, I replied. "In this case the State is not telling you to do wrong" countered this good priest. I then asked him why Christ rebuked Peter for using the sword, and Father Hogan replied: "Peter had no right to take up the sword in defense of the faith when the Master was there to protect all that needed protection." I then asked the priest if Christ was present any more with Peter than He was with me in the guard house at that very moment. A discreet silence followed. Then I asked Father Hogan what Christ meant when he bade us to "overcome evil with good." Father replied that everything in this world is good, that a battleship is good, that a bullet is good, etc. Granted, I told him, but I said, it is the use of these things that makes them evil, and when you use a bullet to kill a man when God has forbade the taking of human life, you are putting that bullet to an evil use and therefore it becomes evil.

While at Camp Funston, Father O'Toole tried to dissuade me from my course. We argued the various points, many of which I will soon touch upon. But we could not agree. Father O'Toole finally said that there was one strong point in my argument, and that point was the admonition repeated by St. Paul that we "overcome evil with good." I told Father O'Toole that if he admitted the inharmony of that philosophy with war, then he admitted everything, for Christ did not contradict Himself. His whole philosophy is complete harmony. Some people say "the Bible contradicts itself." Not so! There is conflict between the Old Testament and the New Testament, but Christ's doctrine is found in the New Testament, and it is Christ Whom Christians should follow. Christ Himself referred to the contrast between the Old and the New Testament doctrine when He said: "You have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, but I say unto you, resist not evil, do good to those that wrong you, etc." War is the eye for an eye doctrine that Christ so unmistakably repudiated.

There was a very distressing experience connected with Father O'Toole's effort to win me over to the war side of this question. As has been the case since my arrest, I was also guarded when talking with Father O'Toole in the Funston guard house. That is the rule in all guard houses. The guard heard our conversation. Next day this guard came to me, and with tears in his eyes said: "I have not been able to sleep during the whole of last night. Your discussion with that priest has convinced me that I am committing a great sin by staying in this army. I do not know what to do, for if I leave the army, my wife and baby will suffer in many ways, as I cannot help them in prison where I would surely land." I asked the soldier if he belonged to any particular denomination. He replied that he was a Methodist. I do not know why I asked him this question, for what difference did it make in this case? Anyway, all that I could do was to express my sympathy for him and to urge him to consult God and to act according to the light that God gave him.

Father McDermott of Camp Dodge, Iowa, was the next priest from whom I had the pleasure of getting a good scolding for my attitude. I must not imply that Father O'Toole was cross with me, and I fear that is just what one would infer from what I said. On the contrary, Father O'Toole was one of the kindest and most considerate of priests that I have met in my prison experience. Father McDermott was a good fellow, but in his gruff manner -- likely assumed for the occasion, for I later learned that he was quite gentlemanly and cultured -- told me that I was on the wrong track, etc., etc. We had the pleasure of disagreeing with each other the entire evening, but the guard came to me the next day and told me that, in his opinion, I had put Father McDermott over the ropes.

Chaplain Smith, a non-Catholic, engaged me in conversation in the Camp Dodge guard house the early part of July, 1918, and after considerable discussion he said, in the midst of quite a gathering of prisoners, guards and officers: "Well, in a time like this, we have to get off the track a little." That, of course, settled the controversy, for if Chaplain Smith was willing to leave the course outlined by the Master, it was certain that his ship would stray far from the safe and righteous course.

Fathers Doherty and Fox at Fort Leavenworth were also among those who were quite willing to admit that I was wrong. Father Seifert at Fort Douglas was rather neutral. I could not just place Father Molloy, but I would not like to be in the position of one trying to force this good priest into the army, for he not only is exceptionally gifted intellectually but is also fearless. I am informed by a certain priest that Father Molloy barely escaped serious trouble for having expressed tolerance for my attitude or some such declaration.

In the magazine published by the Jesuits, named "America", there appears an article by Father Fisher S. J., entitled THE SUPREMACY OF CONSCIENCE. The article appears, I believe, in one of the April, 1918 numbers. Father Fisher gives the "do as

the Romans do" argument an awful jolt when, in concluding his plea for conscience, he declares: "When conscience decrees that God and the State conflict, God, not the State, must be obeyed."

On page 323 of Father Searle's book, PLAIN FACTS FOR FAIR MINDS, appears an analogy in a certain thesis that Father Searle sets out to prove, and the analogy happens to apply to the cases of conscientious objectors against war as well as all conscientious objectors. Again I must bless the Fort Douglas authorities. Were it not for their 100% Americanism, I could quote Father Searle word for word, but the book is at Fort Douglas and I am in the insane asylum out here near where our dear President sits in his office and dreams of the sweet land of liberty. I can quote the substance of Father Searle's argument though. He stated that conscientious objections against obedience to certain laws cannot properly be construed as antagonism toward the state, any more than the conscientious objection that many Northerners had to the returning of fugitive slaves which was a matter of national legislation before the civil war. He further states that the most conscientious citizen is radically the best and most loyal citizen, since the occasions on which he cannot obey the law are few and far between, and the other laws against which he has no scruples, he obeys with an exemplary obedience.

There is an article on page 296 of the March 6th issue of The Nation, which was written by a Catholic priest who very discreetly refrained from signing his name. His name of course is available in the offices of The Nation in case the authenticity of the article is questioned. I remember this article quite well, and, even though my good friends in charge of the Fort Douglas prison have succeeded in blocking me in many ways, I can quote as much of this priest's article as is necessary for present purposes, although I would wish that those interested would get The Nation for March 6, 1920, and read the entire article. The aforementioned priest stated in part, with reference to the conscientious objectors: "These young men did only what the ancient Catholic doctrine obliged them to do. They felt in their hearts that they could not kill their fellow men for the reasons cited by our government, and they manfully submitted to punishment." Those are his exact words. His article sets forth the theological views of Roman Catholic authorities, and there can be no question as to the correctness of his deductions. He states that it was the duty of those who viewed the situation as we viewed it to act just as we did, that is, hold aloof from participation.

It will be remembered that, in the question of conscription, Archbishop Mannix of Melbourne, Australia, led the fight that resulted in the defeat of conscription for that country. It was defeated not once, but twice. Now, if Archbishop Mannix' opposition to conscription was right in Australia, certainly the opposition of the American C.O. to conscription in America was right, even more justified than the stand of the Australian prelate, because in Australia the people were given an opportunity to vote on the issue, while in America it was unconstitutionally thrust upon us without our being allowed to say whether we favored or disapproved. Surely the best way to express disapproval under the circumstances was to resist service.

Nearly all agree that it would have been impossible to pass a conscription law by the vote of the people in the United States, and the politicians in power so keenly realized this that, despite America's vaunted Freedom, compulsory military service was forced upon our citizens. Now, suppose we had been allowed to vote on the issue. Few will oppose the hypothesis that conscription would have been defeated by a more ponderable expression of disapproval than that registered against this relic of antiquity in Australia. Assuming such to have been the case; that is, assuming that the question was voted upon and the measure killed, then such as the writer who disbelieved in war would not have been cast into prison for refusal to participate. Having denied us the constitutional right of voting upon conscription, why should we be blamed for asserting our rights in the only manner left open for such an expression?

George Washington and his followers broke away from the tyranny of England and founded a nation dedicated to the cause of Freedom. Australia is still attached to the Mother country. Thus by a perversion of the principles underlying the foundation of America, twentieth-century politicians revert to the ancient barbarianism of England, while a country like Australia that is still subject to English dictation set us an example in genuine Liberty by allowing its citizens to vote upon conscription. Quite likely America could enjoy the same privilege if we had a few ministers in this country as fearless as Archbishop Mannix. The spineless attitude of those who ought to know better, those leaders of Christian thought in this land that boasts of its civilization, has resulted in untold misery for the whole world, for America had a great opportunity for service that was forever lost when she was dragged into the game of wholesale murder by European intrigue.

The crime of the C.O. consisted not so much in his refusal to slaughter human beings at the behest of profiteers, but because he was in the minority. Had the majority taken the stand that reason and Christianity dictated should have been taken, and which would likely have been taken if they were allowed to vote on the question, then the C.O. would have been blessed in place of cursed for his opposition to organized collective homicide. Those who were brave enough to express their opposition to conscription at the ballot box but were too cowardly to express it by a refusal to surrender their constitutional rights when autocrats forced conscription upon them against their will, joined with the hysterical mob in denouncing those of us who remained loyal to American ideals. We do not chafe under this denunciation, for we have lost nothing. Those who denounce us are the losers. But my mention of the circumstance is merely to point out that, after all, the C.O.s are not the disloyalists that the kept press brands them. When the United States Supreme Court informs us that during the war the Constitution must be relegated to oblivion, it is time to question whether such a Constitution is worth having. What good is the Bible if we use it only in balmy weather? The same question applies to the Constitution.

At the funeral of the American sailors who fell at Vera Cruz, President Wilson said: "I have never been under fire, but I imagine there are some things just as hard to do as to go under fire. I imagine it is just as hard to do your duty when men are sneering at you as when they are shooting at you ... The cheers of the moment are not what a man ought to think about, but the verdict of his conscience." The C.O.s thought of the verdict of conscience, and followed it. And the nation whose Constitution guarantees Freedom of Conscience gave them several huge doses of a certain brand of Democracy.

It was some time in 1916, I believe -- I could give the exact date if the Fort Douglas authorities had not wrongfully separated me from my personal property -- anyway, it was some considerable time before America joined the game that made Heaven weep that President Wilson said: "America can show its devotion to the principles of humanity better by keeping out of this conflict than by getting into it." Just what the C.O.s thought, only they remained true to conviction. Immediately after the sinking of the Lusitania, President Wilson told us that "The example of America must be a specific example of peace." We agreed with our good President, but seemed to make the mistake of thinking about and following "the verdict of conscience" that President Wilson spoke of at Vera Cruz.

Recently, we were given a demonstration of how minorities grow into majorities that is worth citing. I quote from The Nation of July 17, 1920: "Frederick J. Dixon, a Labor man, who, for his stand against the war (in Manitoba) endured the abuse of friend and foe, was mobbed, charged with sedition, arrested, thrown into prison and for a time refused bail, heads the poll in Winnipeg with a huge plurality, a surplus of 7,274 votes as against a surplus of 73 won by the Attorney General, a machine politician. The Rev. Dr. Ivens, Labor candidate, who lost his pulpit through his pacifist views; John Queen, Social democrat, and George Armstrong, Socialist Party of Canada, all of them now in prison, are all elected for the City of Winnipeg. They are serving sentences of one year each for alleged seditious conspiracy in connection with the general strike of last year...One scene which took place in the Manitoba Legislature will not easily be forgotten by those who saw it. It was January, 1917. Dixon had made a speech against the war. He had demanded that nothing be left undone to secure peace. He had asked whether the Allies were as disinterested as they claimed to be, whether after all the boys were not dying for a myth. He quoted from Henry W. Nevinson, A. G. Gardiner, and others to show that it was likely to be the old game of grab. This speech, which as events have proved, was abundantly justified, greatly incensed the Liberals, and after adjournment they gathered in little groups on one side of the chamber, discussing Dixon's 'disloyalty' and his 'treason' while casting angry glances to where he sat alone at his desk. Two newspaper men, one an editorial writer, the other a reporter, shook hands with him as they passed and dared to congratulate him on his speech. Within a week they were both 'fired' from the principal 'Liberal' newspaper of Winnipeg."

Dixon was, before the war, a prominent single taxer of Winnipeg. But, he must have used "defective judgment" because his prominence began to fade. Again quoting from The Nation: "But the war spirit was even then developing and it meant a Calvary for Mr. Dixon. From the first he took the pacifist view point and steadfastly refused to join in the orgy of hatred and unreason. He simply maintained the beliefs and opinions he had always held. He continued to say what he had always said, but slowly his star began to sink. Old friends deserted him. Magazines and newspapers which had delighted to honor him and have him write for them found it undesirable to have his name appear in their pages, or if it found a place there it was for the purpose of abuse and cynical comment. Meetings at which he spoke were broken up, and on one occasion he was attacked by a mob and personally assaulted. A demand was made that he resign from the Legislature. Dixon replied to this by introducing a recall bill applicable to every member. This challenge was refused and he kept his seat. But the tide of popular favor had not left him high and dry." That was just a few years ago. Dixon's recent victory makes him the probable leader of the Labor element that now wields such great power in Manitoba. Have the majority of the voters been attacked by that malady of "defective judgment" or was Dixon's judgment sound from the beginning?

I should have mentioned when reciting our experiences at Fort Douglas that some time in April -- or it might have been during the early part of May, 1920 -- a Doctor Casey, who is considered a mental expert, examined us to determine our sanity. Dr. Casey was an army man, we were slackers and cowards, so he could hardly be expected to approach his task with an entirely unbiased mind. Still, he may have been absolutely impartial. I have no way of determining one way or the other, so, to be on the safe side, I will say that Dr. Casey's examinations were conducted without prejudice. We had no way of finding out just what his final reports were. But I have no doubt that it was his honest opinion that our judgment was defective. And, defective judgment, from the viewpoint of a mental expert, is an indication of deranged mentality. Now, if Dr. Casey had been assigned the task of analyzing Frederick Dixon's mental status at the time that Dixon's unpopularity was at its height, the former would no doubt conclude that the latter was showing defective judgment. But, if the examination should take place now, and since Dixon's judgment has not changed, do you think Dr. Casey would have the courage to declare him mentally deranged? Such a declaration would be equivalent to saying that the majority of the voters -- and quite a large majority at that -- were mentally deranged as they were using defective judgment in choosing a man like Dixon to represent them, a man whose opinions they well knew, a man who, in case of a new war which is quite likely to break out before long, would take and maintain what is termed the pacifist attitude. After all, it did not require much courage on the part of Dr. Casey to put down American C.O.s as persons of defective judgment, because for the time being C.O.s were unpopular.

I am beginning to believe that the case of "defective judgment" against me is, after all, not without foundation. It certainly was a case of defective judgment for me to overlook mentioning the Casey incident. But, you must remember that all that I am writing of my experiences in the various prisons is entirely from memory, for I have been dispossessed of documents that would refresh my memory. As I have stated so many times before, the Fort Douglas officials sent me to the insane asylum and kept all my belongings at Fort Douglas. Too, I am trying to make this as brief as possible, and in my determination to eliminate, I have eliminated something that should have been included. Dr. Casey asked me about twenty questions, most of which were about my relatives. I answered them without hesitancy, and answered them correctly. He asked me why I did not join the army, my answers were brief but comprehensive. The examination was, in my opinion, primarily for the purpose of giving the military authorities an excuse to send us to the insane asylum if they should ever desire to make such a move. In fact, The New York Call and other papers expressed the same opinion at the time, although some of the papers declared the scheme was to railroad us to the insane asylum as soon as the examination was over. Well, in my case, the opportune time for branding me a lunatic occurred when I went on the hunger strike. Easy enough to refer back to Dr. Casey's report and prove that my mind was even then -- some months before my hunger strike -- in a deranged condition. But they did not dare to give me the proper kind of a sanity test, before a board of three or more mental experts. They knew full well that I would demand an additional examination by a board of civilian experts in order to prevent the possibility of bias asserting itself in the test held by the military board.

I will now present the reasons why I am opposed to war and to military preparation as a safeguard against war. I will first dispose of the "preparedness" argument, so that I can deal with war separately. Little need be said about military preparation, for although the profiteers and their newspapers claim that such preparation is to maintain peace, there is not an instance in the world's history where military preparation resulted in anything else but war. And, the greater the preparation, the greater the ensuing slaughter of human beings. The history of all nations proves that, whether the military preparation be on a large scale or on a small scale or on a medium scale, the result is the same, viz: war. You will say that we will always have war. If the people continue to follow blind leaders of the blind, you are correct, but if people will use the brains that God gave them and live according to the teachings of Christ, wars will cease. Yes, Christ said there would be wars and rumors of wars, but He also said that we should not take part in them. Just because it was foretold that Christ would be betrayed, would you be willing to play the part of Judas in order to make certain that the prophecy would be fulfilled? Christ sweat blood in the garden of Gethsemane at the thought of those who, despite His great sacrifice for us, would choose war and hell in preference to peace and heaven.

I oppose war upon political, humanitarian and religious grounds, so I will present the case in this sequence.

When President Wilson was touring this nation after his return from the Peace Conference, he told the people that the recent war was "a commercial war, that the seed of war in the modern world is industrial and commercial rivalry." Who profits from this "industrial and commercial rivalry?" Surely not the soldier lads. The World War produced 17,000 (seventeen thousand) new millionaires in America, in addition to enhancing the fortunes of those who were already millionaires and producing a large army of near millionaires. Of course it was a "War for Democracy" so we should not complain if people not in the service at home became millionaires in consequence of the sacrifices that the conscripts were making overseas. Too, the boys that went across got paid thirty dollars per month for slaughtering their fellow man, and they would only have to keep on killing for 2,777 (two thousand, seven hundred, seventy seven) years in order to save up a million dollars, provided they saved the entire thirty dollars each month. A great many of them had to expend at least \$25 each month to pay for insurance, assistance for dependents, etc., but they should not complain about that for even then, provided they saved \$5 per month they would only have to keep on killing for 16,666 years in order to save up a million dollars. And there is no danger of them running out of ammunition because the profiteers back home are making enough money out of the manufacture of war munitions to insure a steady stream of these deadly missiles being supplied to the brave lads who are fighting for their country's sake.

If I had no humanitarian or religious scruples against war, the fact that wars are fought for the benefit of those who do not participate in the fighting in any other manner than to reap the financial benefits that are a part of the game, would be sufficient to keep me from joining the army. If those who make war had to do the fighting, there would be no fighting. If the kings, kaisers and presidents had to do that that they were too cowardly to do -- viz: face the enemy's bullets -- the World War would have been settled by diplomacy in place of by the slaughter of human beings. Rulers in the various countries blunder and quarrel and stir up strife over issues that are sometimes trivial and sometimes important, and when they fail to settle differences amicably they call out the troops, and the troops on all sides of the controversy go forward to battle in a holy and just cause. If my judgment is defective in withholding from such melees, I wonder what kind of judgment is shown by those who respond to the whims of these international maniacs.

As expressed in the daily papers, America's motives in entering the World War were noble, unselfish, and for the good of humanity. Let us review some of the more salient eventualities of that War and see how much was accomplished. I have already alluded to the number of millionaires that the War for Democracy produced, and the treatment accorded the boys in khaki during the war and since its termination would seem to indicate that the Democracy

was for somebody else besides those who did the fighting. Talk to or rather with the average overseas man, and you will learn something about the Democracy that they got. Of course, there are many of them who feel that they were honored in suffering to produce millionaires, and when they came home a kindly grace from one of those who reaped millions out of the conflict was sufficient to compensate for all that was endured on the battlefields of Europe. All that you need to do with the class that I have just mentioned is to tell them what great heroes they were; how they saved us from the Huns; how the girls think that they are just the grandest persons, the bravest soldiers that ever lived; how proud you are of them; what noble sacrifices they made. Feed them on this stuff for a day or so, pat them on the back, and they are ready to go across and lose the other leg for you. But, there are some of the type of Barbusse who have a different view, the soldiers who do a little thinking seem to have an advantage over those who are content with being mere cannon-fodder. Not long ago one of them told me: "We came back from France, got kicked around like dogs, had to beg for a job, and were insulted over and over again."

Then, there is the bonus. Our congressmen and senators have decided that the country is too poor to dole out even a few dollars in support of those who were ready to sacrifice their lives in a cause that they either believed worthy or felt it their duty to support since the government called them. Our returning heroes are rewarded with speeches, with flattery, with a "thank you." Seems that, in a Democracy it would be unethical to tax the war-made millionaires in order to slightly repay the soldiers for the latter's sacrifices. Congress tells them: "Consider the honor that is yours." Well, didn't the congressmen get some of that honor with an additional \$7,500 a year with a little expense money thrown in?

"Honor" is all right in its place, but it will not pay for a meal ticket. Those who did not go to war made millions out of it. Would it be asking too much to pay every war veteran a bonus -- an immediate cash bonus -- of \$10,000? They saved us from the Huns, made a few million dollars for each of 17,000 privileged individuals, and produced huge fortunes for thousands of others. Surely we ought to be willing to pay each one of these heroes \$10,000. How far would such a proposal get in Congress?

Well, our soldier boys were not selfish, they were not fighting to get Democracy for themselves, they were fighting for humanity. Let us see how humanity fared. Great Britain got more than a million square miles of new territory, so, after all the war was worthwhile, except for those whom Great Britain dispossessed. Ireland, Egypt, India, Persia, and numerous others of the world's small nations got their Freedom -- that is freedom to starve to death or accept the yoke of serfdom. Ireland was especially well rewarded for the sacrifices that her citizens made, because England allowed her to vote on the question of self-government. The vote was four or five to one for an independent Republic, a president duly elected, the new government began to function, and England dispatched 200,000

troops to the Emerald Isle, which troops were supplied with tanks, mounted cannon, plenty of ammunition, in short were provided with every implement of modern warfare, in order to protect the Irishmen from their new government. England believes in protecting the helpless, and she considered it a case of "defective judgment" for those ignorant Irishmen to vote for a Republic, so, in order to shield them from their folly the coercion bill was finally passed by the English House of Lords. It is to be hoped that the Irish people will understand that this is all in the interests of Democracy and for the good of the Irish people. Nor is it an easy matter for England to thus put herself out for Ireland's sake: those soldiers have to be fed and clothed, and it is quite some bother for English tax collectors to fleece the Irish people of sums adequate to supply the needs of the invaders.

Other small nations are suffering, but it is the hope of Democracy that Ireland will show them how to bear their burdens patiently, for, in order to vindicate the War for Democracy, people should accept whatever kind of Democracy they get, and then the American soldiers will feel that their work was not in vain.

It was also a War to Crush Militarism. The American army is today approximately three times its pre-war size. In 1916, there were 4,000 officers feeding at the public crib, but there are now more than 15,000 self-sacrificing Americans strutting around with insignia of high rank, protecting us against future wars. It seems not to occur to them that military preparation against war has never resulted in anything else but war. That, however, is not the issue just now. We are discussing how the World War crushed militarism. France has been speeding up ever since the conflict terminated, England has not been sleeping, Japan is on the job, and every nation on earth with the exception of Germany is crushing militarism by doubling, trebling, quadrupling their armaments. Not long ago, our good friend Mr. Schwab informed us of the fifty-million dollar battleship now in the course of construction for the American navy, while it is only a few weeks since the Tennessee -- the world's largest battleship -- was launched in American waters. Yes, the War to Crush Militarism was won, but the people the world over have lost.

It was "a war to make future wars impossible." And, it was won by those who adopted the phrase just mentioned as their slogan. It is less than two years since the armistice was signed and fighting ceased, but in Western Asia today battles are being staged by about as many different armies as were engaged when the now famed World War introduced itself to the public. Greek and British troops are in a death-grapple with the Turks within the vicinity of Constantinople. Other British troops have been ordered from India into Mesopotamia. The Arabs are fighting the French. Poland and Russia have staged some of the biggest battles in the world's history during the last few months, and, as I am writing, the daily papers herald the possibility of Great Britain, France, and America being drawn into the Russo-Polish controversy. The New Republic of August 4, 1920, in calling attention to how the Versailles treaties work in bringing the world back to a peace basis, asks that we consider

the present plight of Austria, who attempted to settle her differences with Russia and entered into such an agreement. But the diplomats in Central and Eastern Europe feared the probability of Vienna being made the headquarters for Soviet propaganda, "so the experts went ahead and invoked a treaty of peace to keep Austria at war."

Gibbs the Englishman, Latzko the Austrian, and Barbusse the Frenchman have given the world something to think about. How their books on the war can be read and people still believe in the efficacy of that instrumentality for other than evil consequences, will remain perhaps the greatest mystery of the twentieth-century. In years to come, people will look back upon our stupidity and wonder what kind of creatures we were. Gibbs and Latzko and Barbusse were no slackers, they went through the mill, and if you are unwilling to listen to the testimony of a coward writing to you from the criminal ward of an insane asylum, what excuse have you for ignoring the facts that the aforementioned have so fearlessly presented? Quoting from *The Nation*: "The Austrian reserve officer, The French poilu, the English war correspondent all suffered to the full the experience of war, on different sides of the immense field and at different angles of observation. All the more convincing is the similarity of their reports, not merely in the bloody details of human butchery, the physical agonies of men tortured and murdered according to the hellish ingenuity of modern methods, not merely in the sickening stench and utterly degrading personal misery of the daily life of factory fighting, but even more in the wider aspects of command, of political and social intrigue, of the reaction in its entirety of our social organism to the disease of war."

"Both Latzko and Gibbs emphasize the mediocrity and the stupidity of the higher command of armies -- the professional ineptitude of the military class and its revolting ambitions, whose prizes must be priced in human lives. The Englishman describes in much detail the tranquil isolation of headquarters, housed in some lovely chateau far removed from the muck of the shambles, which is manipulated by telephone, inhabited by spruce 'staff pups' and ambitious, wooden-headed officers, where war becomes a problem of maps and mathematics with interludes of convivial discussions. Latzko has an even more vivid picture of the General in Command dwelling apart in a noble castle, a comfortable motor ride from the Front, descending with his staff to the public square of an afternoon for tea and music, who finds the war a good thing, provided it continues long enough, because it has lifted him from insignificance, penury, and dull routine to the position of an autocrat with wayward power of a God of life or death or promotion over thousands of human lives...Barbusse has the more logical and penetrating mind, which perceives that the terrible system of mass slaughter is not an isolated phenomenon of our social order...The same ruthless rule of a selfish, ignorant minority that makes of war such a bloody catastrophe also runs our power states and plunges their peoples into war as the last gamblers' throw in the wicked imperialistic game. In peace as in war there is the same removal of the Higher

Command from the immediate field of anguish, the same incompetence and favoritism, selfishness and profiteering, by those in power."

So, from the political viewpoint, that is, looking at war from the standpoint of the great masses of people, there is but one conclusion: War is a good thing -- for the profiteers and for military men of high rank. That is why I am a political objector to war. I also object on humanitarian and religious grounds, which I will presently explain.

Before going further, I would like to observe one of the peacetime uses of the military forces. Due largely to the use of troops, the streetcar men in Denver lost their recent strike. There was some violence during the strike, five persons were killed and several wounded. The strikers objected to scabs coming in and taking their places, rioting ensued. Judge Whitford had issued an injunction restraining the men from striking, and their going on strike made them liable to the penalties provided for violations of injunction law. Judge Whitford would have the power of the entire United States army to back him up in punishing those who violated his injunctions, and should there be any resistance, the resisters would be dealt with just as the strikers dealt with the strikebreakers. Now, the strikers issued a tacit injunction restraining strikebreakers from taking the jobs of the former, and, when the strikebreakers violated the injunction, the strikers proceeded to use the force of the strikers' law upon the strikebreakers, just as Judge Whitford would use the force of the law upon the violators of his injunction. The result was that, the same army that backed up Whitford's injunction was called into service to prevent the execution of the strikers' injunction. In other words, the army was used both ways against those striving for a living wage.

Nor was trouble sought by the striking car men. They attempted to conduct the strike peacefully, but, as in all strikes, various subterranean forces were at work, and it takes but a tiny flame to cause an explosion where conditions such as described by John S. Goble, organizer for the Denver Trades and Labor Assembly, exist. Said Goble: "The blame for the riots belongs to the local civic bodies which have been agitating for an 'open shop.' Their propaganda had infuriated the workers of the city and made them ready for violence." Nearly 500 American Legion Members in their World War uniforms, supplemented the strong-arm of the municipal police, and the chief of staff at Chicago wired Colorado's governor that troops were being dispatched from Camp Funston for service in the strike.

Yes, labor is treated so nicely by the army that it does seem strange that a person whose sympathies are with labor should oppose the army. The massacre of the women and children in the tent colony at Ludlow is an eternal monument to the humanity and the helpfulness of militarism. In peace as in war, the military forces of a nation help -- the oppressors of mankind. And because of this the C.O.s continue their stand against things military in time of peace as well as in time of war.

It was a little more than a month ago -- on July 4th, 1920, to be exact -- that Lt.-Col. Goodale, Commandant of the Fort Douglas prison, came down to the Compound and addressed the group of conscientious objectors. He wanted us to go to work so that we could be released from prison and he read a telegram from the War Department indicating that a few weeks' work on our part would make free men out of prisoners. Goodale made a good speech, but the men decided to stay in prison rather than to aid the killing machine even slightly. Their sentences ranged from three to ten years, so it was not an altogether easy matter to reject such an alluring offer. Practically all of the men had been in prison for two years and more, some of them for more than three years, and, after being cooped up for so long in Uncle Sam's hotels living a life that is not too full of pleasure, a person would think that one would jump at the offer to get out on such easy terms. The work required of us was not difficult, just light work in and around the prison, but of course it would be helping to maintain the military organization, for a military prison is the backbone of the army. Without a military prison, the profiteers could not maintain an army six months. There have been 11,000 desertions reported since the close of the war. Unthinking youths think that the army is a great thing until they get into it.

Different ones among the group questioned Col. Goodale after he finished his Fourth of July oration. I will recite the questions that I put to him and his answers. You may draw your own conclusions:

Salmon: Do you think that I would be doing the right thing if I asked you to violate a principle?

Goodale: Just what do you mean?

Salmon: You have come to us and asked us to violate a principle that is the substance of your asking us to go to work. What would you think of me if I went up to those soldiers on the hill and asked them to desert the army?

Goodale: The soldiers are serving their country, while you are seeking your own interests.

Salmon: I am serving my country even better than the soldiers are, for in being loyal to God I can do more good for my country in one hour than a million men like you can do in a million years. Col. Goodale, since you think it proper to ask American C.O.s to get into the American army, that is, to leave their stand as C.O.s, and get into the American army, do you think that it was proper for Kaiser Wilhelm to ask the German C.O.s, to abandon their principles and join the German army?

Goodale: Yes. I think that a man ought to fight for his country.

Salmon: Then, according to what you have just said, you think that it was improper for Germans to take the C.O. stand; you have in substance said that you think it their duty to join the German army and slaughter American youths.

In closing my part of this little dialogue, I explained to Col. Goodale that the C.O.'s vision is world-wide, not

confined to the narrow limits of an individual nation. That the difference between his philosophy and ours was: the soldiers in the various nations enlist to slaughter each other; the C.O.s, in the various nations refuse to kill each other, preferring to deal with their fellows in foreign countries with the weapons of friendship and reason. I explained to him that if all Germans served their country as a few German C.O.s served the Fatherland, that unfortunate nation would not now be suffering at the hands of merciless allies. Serving their country after the fashion of Mars has reduced Germany to a desolate and despairing wilderness, she is at the mercy of relentless foes; her grandeur, her civilization, her wealth, and her influence is buried in the dust. Had she followed Christ, she could well have been one of the leading, if not the leading, nations of the world. Those who live by the mailed fist will all have a turn at Germany's fate, for Nemesis does not tarry long.

Col. Goodale concluded his remarks by a story, after which he left the barracks. He told how tolerant he was of other people's views. And he really does possess a considerable degree of tolerance. Anyway, the story runs thusly. When a little boy, he and his two brothers used to observe Sunday in a manner that all pious Christians should observe it. (He did not refer to "pious Christians," I have inserted the words in parentheses.) They were very strict, and would not even play ball on Sunday. Next door to Goodales there lived a Catholic family with fourteen children. Col. Goodale says that those fourteen children used to go to Mass on Sunday and then come home and play ball, raising such a noise that they disturbed everybody in the neighborhood. But, tolerant of other people's views, the Goodales never complained.

Goodales boyhood tolerance was commendable. But something occurred to me that he may not have thought of. Suppose those fourteen Catholic children, who were in the majority, went to the Goodale children, who were in the minority, and, regardless of the latter's religious scruples against playing ball on Sunday, laid before them the alternative of either playing ball or going to jail? And, suppose that the Goodale children, whose judgment those Catholic children considered was defective, decided to accept prison rather than profane their religious convictions? Arriving in prison, suppose the Catholic children said: "We will exempt you from playing ball and release you from prison within two weeks if you will work just a few hours each day fixing up the ball diamond so that it will be in good shape for us to play on Sunday."

There you have the C.O. question illustrated in the life of an army man. True, he was tolerant of the views of those Catholic children. But, in the light of American Democracy, they were even more tolerant of his opinions. I recognize that there is a vast difference between a ball game and war. But the difference is favorable to my argument rather than otherwise, because had those Catholic children attempted to coerce Goodales into playing ball, and had the Goodales acquiesced, the latter would have harmed only themselves. But in joining the army you not only recant, but also injure and kill others in addition. And, as instanced in the eventualities of

the World War, the ends that the militarists set out to attain were defeated. There is less Democracy prevailing in the world today than before the war; all over the world, tyranny and injustice has supplanted what little equity and liberty existed prior to the cannons' roar. Militarism has given way to super-militarism. Subject peoples are more subject than ever. The condition of the masses is by far less tolerable than before the flames of hate seared the tranquil universe, and the oppressive burden of the war will fatten the swollen fortunes of the financiers and famish the larders of the poor for many years to come.

What a sad, sad picture Europe presents to the world today. The condition of Germany and Austria is unthinkable, women and children starving to death by the thousands. The militarily inclined will say they deserve it. But what about the rest of Europe, the victors? And America? Could George Washington have looked into the future and seen 1,700 political prisoners languishing behind prison bars because of an opinion they held and expressed, what would he have thought of the Constitution purchased with the blood of the rebels of '76? Could a man like Palmer² hold a place in the cabinet of George Washington? Could a Palmer have aspired to the presidency and poll the vote in convention that the Democrats at San Francisco gave to the American Kaiser? Had Palmer lived in the time of Washington, it is far more likely that he would have suffered the fate of Benedict Arnold than to become the likely standard bearer of a powerful political element.

Captain Swinburne Hale's expose of A. Mitchell Palmer, which appears in The Nation of June 12th, is an almost unbelievable revelation of "torture, forgery, theft, practiced in the name of Justice ... provoking crime in order to detest it." After referring to the report published by the National Popular Government League, which was "signed by Dean Roscoe Pound of the Harvard Law School and five other teachers of law, and by Frank P. Walsh and five other practicing attorneys, a jury of twelve experts sitting in judgment," Captain Hale goes on to relate how he sat in the House Rules Committee room and listened to Mr. Palmer's defense, "which seemed almost more damning than the indictment, being compounded of false testimony and equivocal boasting." Mr. Palmer is mainly responsible for the fact that America still harbors 1,700 political prisoners, but if democracy were not dead in this country, Palmer couldn't hold office two weeks. The purpose of my reference to Palmer is not so much to condemn him, but to display another evidence of what progress resulted from the war.

Since events have justified the attitude of the political conscientious objector in refusing to participate in the war, let us advance a step and consider why the humanitarian objector will not go to war. There were three classes of conscientious objectors to the recent war, as there are to all wars. That is, all the C.O.s, were divided into three groups, viz: political, humanitarian, and religious. Some objected on purely political grounds, that is, they would not fight in a capitalist war, "a commercial and industrial war" as President Wilson afterwards termed the World War. The humanitarian will not take part in any kind of a war, whether it is

for the benefit of wage earners or profiteers. Seldom is a war waged for the benefit of the masses though. The religious objector, like the humanitarian but for different reasons, will not kill human beings at all. While, as I previously stated, the C.O.s, are divided into three different groups, yet there are some among us who are objectors on both political and humanitarian grounds; and still others who object on all grounds. The writer comes within the latter category. So, although objecting on political grounds, I have still better reasons that I will now outline.

Father O'Ryan, one of Denver's most prominent clergymen, delivered a lecture on the American Flag one night, in which he explained the evolution of love for one's country. He told how first there was the little family group, then the tribe, then the village, then the city, then the state, and finally the nation. And, he explained how, at each stage of this evolution, the love and mutual goodwill that so admirably manifested itself and maintained peace and harmony within the group extended the scope of its influence until finally it encompassed the entire nation, so that now we have a nation of people bound together by the ties of friendship and reciprocal interests that make for understanding and peace. For some reason, Father O'Ryan stopped when he reached national boundaries. Had he pursued the logic of his illustration, he would have encircled the globe with the philosophy of love. But Father O'Ryan is like so many of our priests and ministers, he seems unable or unwilling to look beyond the borders of the good old U. S. A., he is a "patriot." And so it is with the leaders of Christianity in other countries.

The humanitarian objector to war observes that members of a family manage to get along without resorting to military preparation, which inevitably leads to warfare. True, homicides occur, but they are comparatively rare, and in houses where the spirit of love has been properly nurtured, complete harmony prevails. A great many families get along together in a community such as a village, town or city, without resorting to warfare. Yes, they have the municipal police, but if more were equally as charitably disposed as numerous families in the community, there would be no need of police. There are communities that have no police, no prisons. The need of police is no valid argument against the humanitarian's philosophy in so far as his proposal to abolish warfare is concerned, because a system of international policing could be substituted for armies and navies, and these international police could arrest and imprison any and all diplomats and profiteers that tried to stir up strife, just as a municipal copper would put me in the cooler if I went down the street and tried to pick a fight or get the neighbors to throwing bricks at each other. And, after substituting international police for the present system of human slaughter houses, a time would finally come when even the police could be dispensed with, just as in some communities today these representatives of physical force have disappeared. I admit that I am idealizing, but it is a study of ideals that ultimately leads to their adoption.

Cities quarrel with cities, but differences are

adjusted without the use of cannon ball or poison gas. Yes, they have the state militia, but that is analogous to a system of international police. States frequently experience quite serious ructions between each other, but injustices and injuries are purged in the crucible of conciliation, while the same difficulties between nations result in mortal combat. Now, if cities and states can get along without mobilizing armies to press their claims against each other, nations can do likewise. "Where there is a will there is a way." The profit in war is one great barrier to peace between nations, and the lack of genuine Christianity is another. The need of Christianity is greater than any other need, for if we really followed Christ, we would not be seeking riches, and if we did not seek riches that we have to leave behind as our bodies are lowered into the grave, there would be less temptation to excuse the iniquity of war.

I hear a loud, buzzing noise, and as I peer through the bars of my cell I notice an airplane gliding along smoothly, swiftly. As I pause in retrospection, I am taken back to the time when, as a little child the dream of the airplane faddists was laughed to scorn. And so it was with every invention in the early stages of its development. But, somehow, we tolerate invention along mechanical, artistic, scientific or literary lines. Though, any forward movement that is calculated to elevate humanity is frowned upon and its advocates are executed, exiled, or imprisoned; every means possible is used to strangle the new idea, but if the idea is founded upon Truth, its growth can be arrested for a time only. Persecution of those who propose a better way will not forever prevent the adoption of that better way.

It should be evident to the most superficial thinker that an institution which, in order to live, must persecute honest and sincere dissenters is inherently bad. If militarism were sound in principle, it would not need to fear opponents. Since it can exist only by the ruthless suppression of those who question its good in this world, that in itself is a sufficient cause for discarding it. I believe it was Wendell Phillips who said: "Anything that can't stand discussion, let it crack."

Have you ever stopped to consider that the average person gets what little information he gathers concerning human affairs from the daily papers or weekly magazines? As Upton Sinclair says in "The Brass Check" "are you reading facts or propaganda, and whose propaganda?" The average newspaper and magazine is owned and controlled by those whose interests are best served through the maintenance of large armies and navies, and it is therefore unfair to expect them to advocate doing away with those instruments of destruction, any more than it would be right to expect the owner of a brewery to boost for prohibition. When the pocketbook of a wealthy man is threatened with depletion, he fails to see anything but good in the institution out of which he grows richer and richer. When Christ told the rich young man to give all he had to the poor and to follow Him, Christ was not thinking so much of helping the poor as He was of benefiting the rich young man, but the latter preferred hell rather than part with his riches. So it is with those who today are profiting from the manufacture of war's requisites.

I had quite an interesting experience for a few months prior to being kidnapped by the military authorities in May, 1918. Although opposed to war, I wrote an article advocating that the rich be taxed to pay for the war. It may seem inconsistent that an opponent of war should propose a method of financing it, but up to the time that I wrote the article there had been 7,925 new millionaires produced in America as a result of the war (the number finally reached 17,000), and, in writing the article referred to, I proposed that since the people permitted the war to continue, why not let the rich bear their share of the burden? I proposed that wealth be conscripted just as men were being conscripted, not that I favored conscription, but men were being conscripted so why not wealth? My proposal provided for the conscription of all incomes in excess of \$5,000 annually to pay for current war expenses and for liquidation of the debt at the end of the war. It may seem a little harsh to cut a rich man's income down to \$5,000 per year, but the rich were having their wealth protected by the blood of the poor -- at least it is claimed that wars are for protection --, and it seemed not unreasonable that the rich man be asked to worry along on \$5,000 per year during the war, and then after the war was over and all debts paid he could resume his luxurious living. When one considers that the vast majority of poor people were living on less than \$1,000 per year, a war-emergency proposal that would allow the rich to spend five times that amount for their daily bread and a few clothes and other living expenses should not have met with much opposition.

The plan proposed that a petition containing two million signatures be presented to President Wilson, who, upon request of the signers, was to urge the passage of this wealth-conscription bill in congress. This wealth-conscription article was printed in pamphlet form and circulated throughout the United States. The masses favored it, judging by the thousands of signatures that flooded into the collecting point. But the privileged classes disliked the proposal, judging by the storm of opposition that soon manifested itself. Hon. R. B. Tedrow, the U. S. District Attorney for Colorado, told me that he was getting complaints from all over the country. The newspapers attacked the idea, and one evening I was called to the office of the agent of the building in which I had my office, shown an article that appeared in that evening's issue of The Denver Times, and told that I would have to vacate my office as I was giving the building -- the Cooper Building -- a bad name. My rent was paid until the 10th of the following month so I was permitted to stay until the next month's rent was due; a few days before the time expired, the agent of the building reminded me that I must vacate, which I did. The post office authorities finally refused to allow the pamphlets to go through the mail, and pressure was brought to bear that resulted in the Express Company refusing to accept shipments of the pamphlet. All this in spite of the fact that the U. S. District Attorney admitted that from a legal point of view the pamphlet was faultless. And yet, despite its being within the law, the head of the Department of Justice told me I would be prosecuted for publishing

the pamphlet were it not for my pending difficulties with the government over my refusal to answer the Questionnaire, and they did not want to indict me on too many charges at the same time.

Well, it was unnecessary to indict me for advocating wealth-conscription, for a grand little scheme landed me in the hands of the military authorities where I have since remained. I have related only the essential features of this successful attempt to obstruct agitation for the passage of wealth-conscription; there are dozens of interesting details, how letters were held up, how workers in the cause were spied on and intimidated by secret operatives of the government, etc., but I will not waste time telling about these incidents. My only excuse for even mentioning the affair was to produce evidence from my own experiences to prove that, not only are the ordinary newspapers and magazines opposed to anything that will interfere with the war profits of their bosses, they not only will condemn such activities, but they will also incite public officials to suppress all attempts to secure even a small amount of justice. Yet, the average person swears by what he reads in the daily papers.

I have now reached the point where I am ready to introduce testimony that will prove that war or military preparation for war is anti-Christian. If you still think it proper to engage in warfare after having read the objections from the political and humanitarian points of view, then, if you are a Christian, listen to the voice of Christ echoed from the pages of the New Testament. It seems almost a sacrilege that I should argue the question of Christ's sublime teachings; it seems degrading to quote Him and then show the logic of His utterances as antagonistic to things military. But, I am forced to do this in order to prove my case before the minds of those who have either read or heard readings from the New Testament and still fail to comprehend Christ's philosophy of love and of peace.

Addressing myself to Catholics in particular and to Christians in general, I will quote from the Catholic version of the Holy Bible. The citations, however, will warrant the same deductions from non-Catholic Bibles, as can be proved by reference to them. There is only one exception to this rule that I know of, and when I come to that exception I will mention it.

Christ is God, so we will not dispute the wisdom of His teachings. That every utterance of Christ's is the truth, no Christian will dispute. That Christ did not contradict Himself is another assertion that Christians will not challenge, for if He did contradict Himself He would in each contradictory occasion be telling a lie, and as Christians we know that God cannot lie. Moreover, there is no evidence of contradiction in what Christ taught, so the statement that one so often hears: "the Bible contradicts itself" cannot be proved. The Old Testament and The New Testament contain contradictory philosophies of life, that is because in the days of the Old Testament people lived under the Law, while we are living under Grace since the death of Christ, for by His death He purchased redemption for the human race.

"You can prove anything by the Bible" is another falsehood so often heard. I have yet to meet the person who can make good on this assertion.

If I prove that war is unChristian, it will be unnecessary to prove that military preparation is unChristian, for military preparation has never, will never, result in anything else but war. I cannot prove that military preparation will always result in war, but the logic of facts plainly indicates that such will be the case. As I stated once before, there is not a single instance in the history of the world where military preparation did not result in warfare, either at home or abroad, either upon its own citizens such as workers striking for a living wage or upon those styled as enemies by the profiteering press.

Webster's dictionary defines "War" thusly: "A contest between nations, carried on by force; declared and open hostilities; the profession of arms; a state of contest; enmity; hostility; to contend; to fight." It defines "military" as "pertaining to soldiers, arms, or war." It defines "navy" as "war vessels of a nation." It defines "army" as "a body of men armed for war."

The foregoing definitions justify the proposition that War is a contest between nations, carried on by force through the instrumentality of armies and navies which are used to wound and to kill those who are a party to the contest, and to continue this wounding and killing until such time as one side agrees to submit to the terms of its opponent, or until both sides mutually agree to stop fighting. Reduced to simpler terms, war could be defined thusly: war is physical force used to wound and to kill human beings.

Of course war involves considerably more than stated in the foregoing. But I want to make the argument as simple as possible, and since hardly anybody will deny that war is a process of wounding and killing human beings, we may proceed. Understand, I have not as yet considered the justification for war, which is a different question. I have only attempted to state what war is.

Now, as to the justification of war. Considered from the viewpoint of every contestant, all wars are just wars, and every contender in the armed conflict feels that he is more justified than his opponent. In fact, each side thinks that it is entirely right, entirely justified, and that the enemy is entirely wrong. The Central powers in the World War claimed they were fighting a justifiable war of defense, and the Allies claimed that they were fighting a justifiable war of defense. Both sides cannot be right, but as each side claims that the other side is wrong, and as a person cannot fight on both sides at the same time, it is evident that only God knows who is the more righteous, although according to His law both sides are doing wrong in resorting to the use of such instruments.

Not only does each side think it is right, but also that this particular war that it is engaged in is more justified than any war in the world's history. So thought the Northerners and the Southerners

during the Civil War, so thought the Allies and the Central Powers during the World War. Both sides are sure they are right. According to Christ, both sides are wrong.

Speaking of the World War, A. Mitchell Palmer said: "Every instinct of my nature, planted there by heredity, by training at my mother's knee, by education by teaching in the holy place of God's worship, revolts at the thought of war -- yet I was for this war from beginning to end." I believe that Mr. Palmer expressed the views of all the Christians who supported the recent war. He expressed the views of all the Christians who have participated in all wars. "Every instinct of my nature, planted there by heredity, by training at my mother's knee, by education, by teaching in the holy place of God's worship, revolts at the thought of war -- yet they are for the particular war that strikes them and they are for it from beginning to end." And so it will be until Christians follow Christ in place of the profiteers.

As a young boy, I was quite a patriot. I remember well how proudly I took part in the school drills. One time I was in a play, and much to my delight I was chosen for a soldier. I was about ten years old. I prized my uniform more than I did my life, I had my picture taken in it. I learned to sing patriotic songs, I read war books, and when the soldiers were marching off to war with Spain I was broken hearted to think that I could not go with them. When they came back, my brother Joe and I nursed one of the soldiers for months, his name was Charles Ott. Ott used to tell us all about the war. I became more patriotic. I was young, and I did as the Romans were doing. It was only a few years later in life that I began to wonder how the Catholic Church reconciled war with the commandment "Thou shalt not kill." That commandment and the fact of war caused the earliest mental conflict of which I have any recollection.

You will say that "Thou shalt not kill" did not prohibit war, because the God Who gave that commandment afterwards ordered His children to take part in certain wars. If I lived in the days of the Old Testament and God said: "Thou shalt not kill" I would feel it my duty to God to not kill. Then, if He came along a little later and through Moses or any other of His representatives ordered me to participate in a certain war, I would feel it my duty to God to do just as He ordered. God has a perfect right to forbid us to kill, then to order us to kill, and then again to forbid us to kill. But, we are Christians, and we must do as Christ said, and there is not an instance since the dawn of Christianity where Christians were ordered by God to go to war. On the contrary, all of Christ's teachings prohibit not only war but also it's incident hatred, anger, etc. In Matthew 5:21 Christ says: "You have heard that it was said of them of old: Thou shalt not kill. And whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment. But I say to you that whosoever is angry with his brother, shall be in danger of the judgment." Here we are forbidden to kill -- and who will say that in war you do not kill? -- and we are also told that we must not even be angry with our brother. And by "brother" Christ plainly meant all persons. In the non-Catholic Bible, rather in certain editions of

non-Catholic Bibles, there is an interpolation which has changed the citation just quoted to read: "whosoever shall be angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment." The interpolation "without a cause" vitiates the entire passage, for we always feel that we have a "cause" that justifies anger and warfare. But, since the words "without a cause" do not appear in the original manuscripts from which the Catholic Bible is printed, we will consider that they do not appear in the Bible. In fact, there are many non-Catholic Bibles that are "revised" editions of the Catholic Bible that have not impaired the scriptural passage referred to. The reason that I have mentioned this case is because many Christians, who happen to possess a Bible that contains the interpolation, maintain that that proviso "without a cause" justifies them in becoming angry or taking part in war under certain conditions.

In the same chapter of Matthew just quoted from, we read: "Blessed are the merciful." According to the Germans, the Allies were not very merciful in the matter of terms. But I suppose that is merely another case of "defective judgment." According to the French, Bismarck was not very merciful after Germany's victory in 1871. Very simple: just another case of "defective judgment." The victors are never merciful, for war is an agency of the devil and the devil's philosophy is "Blessed are the unmerciful."

In the same chapter we read: "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God." In the entire New Testament you cannot find a single passage that would even suggest "Blessed are the warmakers."

In Matthew 19:18, we read the story of the man who asked Christ: "Good master, what good shall I do that I may have life everlasting?" And Christ told him to "keep the commandments." He then asked our Divine Lord which of the commandments. And Jesus recited all of them, but the first one that he uttered was: "Thou shalt do no murder." Webster's dictionary defines murder as: "The killing of a human being with malice aforethought." Webster's dictionary defines malice as: "wicked intention of the mind." It defines wicked as: "evil in principle or practice." It also defines wicked as: "sinful."

I want to prove that war is murder -- it is wholesale murder, but murder nevertheless. And Christ said: "Thou shalt do no murder." According to Webster's dictionary, murder is the killing of a human being with a sinful intention beforehand. Let us first consider whether there is an aforethought to the taking of human life in war. A soldier is trained for months, sometimes for years, in order that he will be efficient in the art of slaying. At regular intervals they have target practice in the army, and when a man becomes an "expert rifleman" his pay is increased five dollars per month. This raise is an inducement for him to learn how to shoot better. For what? So that he will not miss fire when he aims at a human being. Unquestionably the "aforethought" is there. He knows just why he is trying to become an expert soldier in every particular.

Regarding whether the "aforethought" is "sinful." Every Christian knows that it is sinful to disobey God, and God has said to not kill. So, war is not only killing, it is murder. Christ said to not kill, to not murder.

St. Paul was a militarist before his conversion to Christianity. He held the coats of those who wrote the first chapter of Christian martyrdom by stoning St. Stephen to death. And while on his way to Damascus to persecute the Christians, the one who would later become St. Paul was brought to the light of truth in that dramatic manner known to every reader of the Bible. St. Paul was a learned man. He was a warrior -- before his conversion. Since I am a pacifist of deranged mentality, it is no wonder that you will not listen to me. But let us see how St. Paul interpreted the teachings of Jesus.

In the twelfth chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans we read: "To no man rendering evil for evil. Providing good things, not only in the sight of God, but also in the sight of all men...Revenge not yourselves, my dearly beloved; but give place unto wrath, for it is written: Revenge is mine, I will repay saith the Lord. But if thy enemy be hungry, give him to eat; if he thirst, give him to drink. For, doing this, thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head. Be not overcome by evil, but overcome evil by good."

War renders "evil for evil," does not "provide good things in the sight of all men," and seeks to avenge ourselves for wrongs done to us; whereas St. Paul reminds us that the Lord is the avenger of evil. St. Paul's doctrine does not fit in very well with war, for if he were on the firing line, met a few of the enemy who were hungry, and gave them something to eat besides cold steel, there would be a rather uninteresting court-martial procedure followed by posting a death-watch in front of St. Paul's cell. And when St. Paul said "if thy enemy thirst, give him to drink" he certainly did not mean to give him liquid fire. It is plain that giving food and drink to your enemy would "heap coals of fire upon his head" is a figure of speech only, meaning that in returning good for evil our action would overcome just as effectively as if we actually heaped coals of fire upon the head of the enemy.

Finally, St. Paul admonishes "be not overcome by evil, but overcome evil by good." Here is Christianity in a nutshell. In Matthew 5:39³ Christ urged the same line of conduct. In ordinary affairs of life, we apply this philosophy. For instance, we do not attempt to overcome lying with lies, we overcome it with truth. We do not try to overcome curses with curses, but we overcome with silence or with words of friendship. That is, whenever we overcome, such is the method. Of course some Christians will meet cursing with curses, but that does not subdue the blasphemer. Sickness is not overcome with sickness, it is overcome with health. If I cut my finger, the remedy is not to cut another finger but to succor the original wound. Anger is overcome by meekness, pride by humility. And the successful way to overcome the evil of war is by the good of peace, a steadfast refusal to "render evil for evil."

You will remember my reference to Father O'Toole. This good priest was able to put up some kind of an argument against all of Christ's teachings against war with one exception, and that exception was "overcome evil with good." He admitted that such a doctrine was a negation of war, which admission, as I reminded him, was equivalent to saying that all of Christ's teachings are in opposition to war, because as explained in the beginning -- although an explanation was unnecessary -- Christ did not contradict Himself.

In the chapter following the one from which I just quoted, St. Paul says: "Let every soul be subject to higher powers: for there is no power but from God: and those that are, are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. And they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation." According to this, say the militarists, you should go to war when your superiors order you to go. But it seems that St. Paul was speaking, not of politicians militarily inclined, but of those "higher powers...ordained of God" for the ministry. For, in the very next verse he says: "Do that which is good: and thou shalt have praise from the same. For he is God's minister to thee, for good. But if thou do that which is evil, fear: for he beareth not the sword in vain. For he is God's minister: an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil." The "sword" here spoken of is the "sword of the spirit" as St. Paul referred to it in his Epistle to the Ephesians.

In the eighth verse of the same chapter that I quoted from in the paragraph just finished, St. Paul says: "For he that loveth his neighbor, hath fulfilled the law." Which makes it plain that he did not refer to a "sword" of steel in speaking of God's avenger, for God's ministers are human beings and they too are obliged to love their neighbor. That the use of a worldly sword is not a manifestation of love was instanced by Christ when he rebuked Peter for having used it.

Then in the 9th verse of this same chapter, the 13th chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, this former militarist says: "Thou shalt not kill," and he goes on to recite numerous other commandments, concluding thusly: "And if there be any other commandment, it is comprised in this word, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

In that passage just previously quoted, St. Paul was reiterating the words of Christ found in Matthew, chapter 22: "Jesus said to him: Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind. This is the greatest and the first commandment. And the second is like to this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments dependeth the whole law and the prophets."

"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." I have never heard an explanation of how war is an expression of love for our neighbor. Certainly it is not loving him as we wish to be

loved, for in going to war one declares that he does so in order to put a stop to the other fellow warring on him. So, if it is an expression of love, it is the kind of love that God forbade because he said: "love thy neighbor as thyself." You do not want anybody to make war on you, not because you dislike the person, but because you dislike the effect that war has upon you. In other words, the thing you love is not war, so, if you do not love it for yourself, you should not apply it to others if you are going to love them as you love yourself. And Christ tells us that upon this love "dependeth the whole law and the prophets." In other words, upon this love dependeth our eternal salvation. It is a question of war and hell, or peace and heaven. Take your choice.

I believe it is clear that if we are going to show our love for our neighbor, we must adopt some other means besides tattooing his body with a Lewis machine gun. If you love me, I really prefer that you show your love in some other way besides massaging me with a bayonet.

Love of course is, like everything else, relative. Christ did not expect me to love a stranger as much as I love my mother. But even though love is relative, it never reaches a level so low as to warrant an injury. The opposite of love is hate, and the amount of hate that finds expression in every war, of which we found an appalling example in the recent conflict, warrants the conclusion that war is hate, peace is love.

While I was in the dungeon at Fort Leavenworth, Father Doherty was trying to persuade me to go to work. He meant well, but he wanted me to assist an evil institution, so I declined. To prove that I ought to do as I was told, he had Major Smith, the executive officer call my attention to 1-Peter 2:13 which reads: "Be ye subject therefore to every human creature for God's sake: whether it be to the king as excelling; or to governors as sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of the good: for so is the will of God, that by doing well you may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men." Now, one can be "subject to every human creature for God's sake," without doing wrong when any of those creatures order you to do wrong. In the very next chapter of that same Epistle of Peter, he tells us: "And in fine, be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another, being lovers of the brotherhood, merciful, modest, humble: Not rendering evil for evil, nor railing for railing...For he that will love life, and see good days...let him seek after peace and pursue it: Because the eyes of the Lord are upon the just, and his ears unto their prayers: but the countenance of the Lord upon them that do evil things."

"Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's,"⁴ is another text that the war makers call to their rescue, but, as a rule, they omit the latter part "and unto God the things that are God's." God requires obedience to His command "Thou shalt not kill" and to His admonition "overcome evil with good," and if we "render unto God

the things that are God's," we will not obey Caesar when he orders us to go to war.

To render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, requires that we obey the laws of the land and pay our taxes provided that those laws do not conflict with God's laws. But when a conflict manifests itself, then as Father Fisher said: "God and not the State must be obeyed."

Some say that in paying taxes we are helping the army. Quite true, for although the amount taken from us in taxation to pay for the upkeep of militarism and navalism is quite small as compared with other governmental expenses, it helps to maintain the army and the navy nevertheless. Which only proves the impossibility of carrying our opposition to the killing institution to the point of 100% so long as we live in society. Taxes, however, are wrung from us by force, just as I am being fed by force on my hunger strike. If I did not pay my taxes, the property taxed would be confiscated, thus providing more revenue than if I paid the tax. The only way to escape paying taxes to help support the killing machine, would be to stop eating, for even the food we buy has a tax included in the purchase price of the food, which tax has in part been dropped into the finance department of our national butchering process. So, when not in prison, I admit that I am indirectly aiding militarism whenever I make any purchases of life's necessities, but, since the aid that I render is taken from me by force and is after all the minimum, I am willing to live on and preach Christianity rather than die of hunger and cold. I am not trying to dodge the fact that I do help in such an instance, but the aid I tender is reduced to the minimum, taken from me by force, and I am enabled to expend my energies toward abolishing the system. If I were to abandon my hunger strike, I would repudiate that stand that I have taken in prison to reduce the assistance rendered militarism to a minimum.

But, it is hardly necessary to split hairs. If everybody would refuse military service, we would not be taxed for the upkeep of the machine for its upkeep would be past history.

We need not fear that if we oppose militarism we will lose our lives. A stand for Christianity will have the support of its Author. If one dies while taking such a stand, God's will be done, it is better to die in that manner than to get a few years' lease on life at the cost of our immortal soul.

"And whosoever will force thee one mile, go with him other two," said our Lord Jesus Christ in still further explaining his doctrine of non-resistance. Does the citation that I just quoted from Matthew 5:41 harmonize with the doctrine of war? Would a soldier or an army of soldiers allow themselves to be forced back a mile without offering any resistance and then be willing to voluntarily go one or two more miles? If not, their actions would be contrary to what Christ taught. Nor would the Christian be idly engaged while going for a mile or two or more with an adversary, for all the while

he would be preaching the Word of God to the person or persons thus forcing him to do something against his wishes. Which is better: to wound or kill the person or persons who try to compel you to do something that you do not want to do, or to submit to their aggression and preach the gospel to them? By bearing the injustice for God's sake, you accomplish a three-fold end: First, you obey God, who will reward you in various ways for your obedience; Secondly, you open or help to open the eyes of a non-Christian to the light of faith in place of closing them in death while he is still ignorant of God's word or obstinate in accepting it; and, thirdly, you remain true to Christian principles in place of playing the part of a hypocrite. God promises beforehand to reward you, and He has the power to reward you. Trust Him, there is nothing to lose, everything to be gained.

"And if a man will contend with thee in judgment, and take away thy coat, let go thy cloak also unto him," we read in Matthew 5:40. Does not sound much like the soldier's philosophy. I have heard people say: "Anyone who would act in that manner is a coward!" Not so, it takes a courageous man to live the Christian ideal. It is much easier to follow the natural impulse of our animal selves and strike back. It takes a man to contain himself, and it takes a genuine Christian to place more reliance upon the unseen power of God than upon his own ability to defend himself against injustice.

Non-resistance does not mean to say nothing or do nothing when we are wronged. The term "non-resistance" is really a misnomer, but it suffices to convey an idea in the absence of a better term. It means to avoid resisting with evil. As St. Paul said: "To no man rendering evil for evil, overcome evil by good." Non-resistance means not a cowardly, submissive attitude, but a courageous, aggressive use of our intellect and a Christian exercise of the good spirit within us.

Take for instance the World War. The devil was functioning through the Kaiser and it became our task to put him out of business. The spirit of good and the spirit of evil is a part of every human being, and it is up to us to determine which spirit shall be supreme. In giving us free will, God placed upon us the matter of deciding whether we wanted Him or the devil to reign within us. If we allow Him to do so, urge Him by prayer and other pious practices, He will dwell within us every second of our existence. According to the Kaiser, he was fighting a defensive war, but according to us -- that is according to those who were blind to the facts -- he was fighting an aggressive war. All wars are defensive, yet all wars are aggressive. Anyway, in order that I may fully agree with American patriots, I am going to assume that the Kaiser was entirely at fault and that the Devil had complete control over him and directed his actions. Surely you would not say that God prompted the Kaiser to do the things he did! So, from the viewpoint of the Christian, if it was not God, it was the Devil. Well, the Devil was running around loose and he had to be chained up so that he would be harmless. We had our choice: either

fight the spirit of the Devil in the Kaiser with the spirit of the Devil in ourselves, or overcome the spirit of the Devil in the Kaiser with the spirit of God in ourselves. We had our choice of rendering evil for evil or overcoming evil with good. Since we declared that the Kaiser was engaged in an evil undertaking, and since we adopted his methods of procedure and used weapons as nearly like his as we could get hold of, it is evident that we used evil means to fight an evil object. The result is that nothing but evil came out, as previously related in stating the dismal eventualities of those black pages in history.

Having once again learned that to oppose evil with evil will avail us nothing, no matter how pure our motives may be, it seems that we ought to be willing to try God's way just once. After thousands of years of repeated failures, it would seem that rational beings would try some other scheme.

"You have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thy enemy. But I say to you, love your enemies: do good to them that hate you: and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you...For if you love them that love you, what reward shall you have? Do not even the publicans this? And if you salute your brethren only, what do you more? Do not also the heathens this? Be you therefore perfect as also your heavenly Father is perfect." -- Matthew 5: 43-48. Here we have another repudiation of the Old Testament doctrine, and more proof as to what Christ's rule of life really is. A certain priest at Camp Funston, an old army chaplain, whose name I failed to learn, told me that Christ's teachings were only admonitions of perfections. This is partly true. But Christ reiterated the commandments as commandments, and it was the rest of His teachings, such as that just quoted, that could, if one wanted to split hairs, be construed as merely admonitions of perfections. But why admonish us thusly if such admonitions were not a part of Christianity? Even though we should ignore these admonitions, the command "Thou shalt not kill" would still negate warfare, but, it seems to me to indicate defeat when one resorts to the plea that Christ's teachings are only admonitions of perfections. And yet we can grant that such is a fact; then what does Christ say? "Be ye therefore perfect as also your heavenly Father is perfect." This proves that He wanted us to live, not a part of His doctrine, but all of it. And, He will supply the necessary grace; all that we need to do is to place ourselves in His hands and say: "Here I am, O God, do with me what You will."

The trouble with us is that we are afraid that Christ's rule of life will not work. We believe that He is God; we believe that He meant what He said; we believe that He has the power and the disposition to bless our efforts with success; we have faith in Him; yet, despite all this, we are actually afraid to practice His teachings for fear that we might lose out in the experiment. If we acted toward God as we should, we should not look upon the try out as an "experiment" but would approach every problem in life with positive assurance that the truth that Christ taught is invincible and that to live as He exhorted will redound to the

best interests of our neighbors and ourselves.

In the third chapter of Daniel, we are told of an incident that, in many ways, is a parallel of the modern Christians compromising on the question of militarism and "doing as the Romans do." King Nabuchodonosor made a statue of gold, and set it up in the plain of Dura. Then he sent for the nobles, the magistrates, the judges, the captains, the rulers and governors, and all the chief men of the provinces to come to the dedication of the statue and commanded of the nations and tribes that in the hour when they would hear the sound of the trumpet and of the flute and of the harp, they should fall down and adore the golden statue. And they warned the populace that if any man did not fall down and adore the golden statue, he would in that hour be cast into a furnace of burning fire. This was much on the same order as our misrepresentatives gather in Congress and command that we adore the pagan institution of militarism, warning us that dissenters will be cast into prison.

The people did not want to adore the golden statue. Not all the people objected, but many knew that it was wrong. Then they thought about that furnace of burning fire, and they decided that after all "when you are in Rome you should do as the Romans do," and they knelt prostrate before the idol. There were, however, three conscientious objectors named Sidrach, Misach and Abdenago. In fury and in wrath, Nabuchodonosor commanded that these three mentally deranged patients with "defective judgment" be brought before him, and he asked: "Is it true that you do not worship my gods, nor adore the golden statue that I have set up?" He gave them another chance, and again warned them that failing to obey his orders, they would be cast into the fiery furnace, concluding "and who is the God that shall deliver you out of my hand?"

Sidrach, Misach, and Abdenago answered: "We have no occasion to reply to thee concerning this matter, for behold our God, whom we worship, is able to save us from the furnace of burning fire, and to deliver us out of thy hands. But if He will no, be it known to thee, O King, that we will not worship thy gods, nor adore the golden statue which thou hast set up."

These young men were not afraid of consequences. They had an abiding faith that God would deliver them from the fiery furnace, but even though it pleased Him not to deliver them, they were intent upon loyalty. Whereupon Nabuchodonosor commanded the strongest men that were in his army, to bind the feet of Sidrach, Misach, and Abdenago, and to cast them into the furnace of burning fire. The command was obeyed, "and the flame of the fire slew those men that cast in Sidrach, Misach and Abdenago," while the three latter fell down bound in the midst of the furnace of fire, and they walked in the midst of the flame, praising God and blessing the Lord. The king's servants ceased not to heat the furnace with brimstone and tow and pitch and dry sticks, and the flame mounted up above the furnace forty-nine cubits, breaking forth and

burning such of the Chaldeans as were near the furnace. Then the Angel of the Lord went into the furnace, drove the flame of the fire out of the furnace, and made the midst of it like the blowing of wind bringing dew, and the fire did not touch nor trouble nor harm any of the inmates. After they sang the praises of God for some time, King Nabuchodonosor appeared on the scene, and, greatly surprised at finding them alive, ordered them to come out.

And the nobles, magistrates, judges, and the great men of the King gathered around and observed that the fire had no effect upon the bodies of those that had been cast into the furnace, that not a hair of their heads had been singed nor their garments burned. Then Nabuchodonosor began to glorify God declaring: "no other God can save in this manner." At the conclusion of the chapter following the one from which I quoted the incident of the three young men in the fiery furnace, we read: "Therefore, I, Nabuchodonosor do now praise, magnify, and glorify the King of Heaven; because all His works are true, and His ways judgments, and them that walk in pride He is able to abase."

Sidrach, Misach and Abdenago had perfect faith in God, were delivered by Him from the designs of their enemies, and the example that they set converted the king.

There are fiery furnaces today into which Christians are cast and will be cast if they follow God in place of militarism. While the flames of the fiery furnaces of today are different than those that Sidrach, Misach and Abdenago were subjected to, the suffering is keen nevertheless. But, if you have faith, there is nothing that you will be unable to endure. True, we may lose our lives if we are loyal to God, but we are not certain to live on in disloyalty. I would rather be one of the C.O.s who died in the stand for genuine Christianity than to be wearing a breast full of medals for service rendered the Devil on fields of battle. Our bodies, medals, and knowledge of military achievements will pass away, but the soul lives on forever, and the eternity of the soul is an eternity of misery or an eternity of happiness according to the revelations of holy writ. Man's finite mind cannot comprehend the justice of punishing him for all eternity, but if we knew as much as God knows it is quite likely that things might appear different to us than they now appear.

"Safety first" is our motto concerning things material. We take every precaution to preserve our bodily health, to safeguard against accidents, to conserve every faculty of this mortal body that must some day sooner or later -- and the latest soon -- crumble into dust. Not so with our souls, they may starve, their present and future lives placed in jeopardy, and we go on carelessly, paying no attention to things eternal until we are on the brink of the grave, then, if we have time, we try to make peace with God. Consider a parallel: The municipal code prohibits speeding and reckless driving of automobiles, and provides penalties for offenders. State Street in Chicago is from east to west, while

Michigan Boulevard extends from north to south. At the intersection of these two streets, as is the case in every city and most towns, a traffic policeman prevents collisions. But, I am a speed maniac, a reckless driver, care nothing about the rights of others, and when out on country roads I give 'er all the gas she can consume. You are a law-abiding citizen and always drive your car at a moderate rate of speed. We are now out in a district where there are no traffic cops, and approaching each other at right angles. You notice me in time to either speed up and crash into me, or to continue your moderate rate of speed and avoid an accident. I am violating the law, and I am endangering your life and the lives of many others. Had you approached the intersection a little sooner, you would not have had time to stop before I crashed into you.

Why not take the law into your own hands, turn on a little more juice and ram my car just about in the center? That would teach me a good lesson.

There are many reasons why you refrain from adopting this method of restraining me. You know that the law will punish me, provided the motorcycle cop gets my number and hauls me into court. You know that if you increased the speed of your car for the deliberate purpose of giving me a good jolt that the judge would fine you as well as me, provided he knew or learned that you purposely rammed into me; you would wreck your car as well as mine; and you might get hurt or killed. These are the main reasons why you refrain, in the instance of auto driving, from overcoming evil with evil.

Carry the illustration a little farther. Keep in mind that I am a ruthless violator of the law pertaining to the driving of automobiles. I care nothing for the rights of others, I am heedless of protests. You know my mania for carelessness and speed, but you see me in time to cut off the power and put on the brakes, thus preventing a collision. In the instance that I am now relating, each of us is going so fast that, unless you slow up, violent impact is inevitable. It would be useless for me to put on the brakes, for I am going at such speed that I cannot slow up sufficient to prevent the accident. While you are going faster than instanced in the previous paragraph, yet reduced momentum will save both of us. Without hesitancy you bring your car almost to a stop, thus barely avoiding contact.

In other words you overcame evil with good. You overcame the evil of speeding with the good of restraint. You opposed dynamics with statics. You have faith in the law of the land, and when it is good for your body you overcame evil with good. But you lack faith in the law of God, and, although it is good for your soul, you ignore the precept of the omniscient One that we overcome evil with good. In the case of the auto driving, you know that I will be punished for my evildoing if the judge learns of my misconduct. You also know that there is no possibility of God not

learning of the misconduct of those who wrong you; that any punishment they deserve will be meted out to them both in this life and in the life to come. As St. Paul reminds us: "Revenge is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord."

My brother John related a conversation that he had with some priest. I do not remember the priest's name, but the latter used as an argument in defense of war "that self-preservation is the first law of nature," and when attacked we must defend ourselves. In other words "I shall be destroyed if I do not destroy you." We fear that God cannot cope with the situation, so we take the matter into our own hands regardless of His command "thou shalt not kill." In fact, we make every preparation to kill long before our friends whom we have reason to believe are going to become enemies declare war upon us. It seems reasonable to believe that since God requires that we overcome evil with good, since He forbids killing, since He assures us that His power and His grace will attend efforts to defeat our enemies with the weapons of love and friendship and kindness that we would prepare along those lines instead of making ready to slaughter.

In the Washington Herald of August 11, 1920, we read: "The District's 10,000 naval reservists have been called to voluntarily join the colors. Immediate response, which means an enlistment of not less than 12 and not more than 18 months, is sought by the Naval Department, that the cruiser St. Louis and flotilla of six destroyers, now in Philadelphia, will be fully manned for an unknown Mediterranean cruise, starting September 8, 1920." The Herald says that there is "mystery in the order, that it may mean dispatching of forces to zone of European conflict." The element of fear is obvious. Uncle Sam has an idea that somebody is going to start something some place and he wants to have the drop on that somebody. It would hardly do for a Christian nation to pray for that somebody and for ourselves, and to prepare to treat that somebody as Christ advocated, for such conduct would not be practical nor would it benefit manufacturers of war munitions.

Now, going back to the statement of that priest who told my brother that "self-preservation is the first law of nature." I agree with him. It is just a question of the best manner in which we can defend ourselves, and my contention is that God's way is best. Let us investigate. And let us see how Christ's doctrine squares with sending those destroyers and the St. Louis for a Mediterranean cruise. I will quote at more length from the sixth chapter of Matthew wherein Christ says, in verses 24 to 34:

"No man can serve two masters. For either he will hate the one, and love the other: or he will sustain the one, and despise the other. You cannot serve God and mammon. Therefore I say to you, be not solicitous for your life, what you shall eat, nor for your body, what you shall put on. Is not the life more than the meat: and the body more than the raiment? Behold the birds of the air, for they neither sow, nor do they reap, nor gather into barns: and your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are not you of much

more value than they? And which of you by taking thought, can add to his stature by one cubit? And for raiment why are you solicitous? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow: they labour not, neither do they spin. But I say to you, that not even Solomon in all his glory was arrayed as one of these. And if the grass of the field, which is to day, and to morrow is cast into the oven, God doth so clothe: how much more you, O ye of little faith? Be not solicitous therefore, saying, What shall we eat: or what shall we drink, or wherewith shall we be clothed? For after all these things do the heathens seek. For your Father knoweth that you have need of all these things. Seek ye therefore first the kingdom of God, and his justice, and all these things shall be added unto you. Be not therefore solicitous for to morrow; for the morrow will be solicitous for itself. Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof."

Now, at the very outset Christ tells us that we cannot serve two masters. If the teachings of the world and of God conflict, we must choose whichever master we are going to follow. I believe that I have shown that there is a conflict between the philosophy of militarism and the philosophy of Christianity. And by militarism I mean the use of the army or navy in time of war, or the maintenance of these institutions in time of peace. But, if I have not yet proved the inharmony of militarism with Christianity, I will do so before finishing. If what I will write just at this particular time is unacceptable to you now, it will be acceptable as properly deducible from the premise that if not already established soon will be, viz: the master Militarism is antagonistic to the master Christianity.

In urging "be not solicitous for your life, that you shall eat, nor for your body, what you shall put on," and then telling us how the birds who neither sow nor reap nor gather into barns are fed by our heavenly Father, afterwards reminding us that we are of more value than the birds, is an indication to me that Christ wanted to impress us with the fact that if we follow Him there is no danger of suffering from worldly ills as the result of refusing to do as the world wants us to do. It may appear that my own experience disputes this assumption. I followed Christ, refused to take part in war, and I have suffered greatly as the result of it. Since the time I was first arrested, I have been incarcerated in eleven different prisons -- some of them for but a brief interval -- and in the others for from two months to more than a year. And now I am confined in a lunatic asylum and in the worst place in the institution, viz: the ward for the criminally insane. I have already related some of the unpleasant experiences that I have had in the various homes that dear Uncle Sammy provided me with. Had I taken the opposite course, I would have had a soft snap in the non-combatant branch of the army service, perhaps made a good record, and have been at home with my family shortly after the conclusion of hostilities in November, 1918. But, this is no proof that I have lost anything in serving God. Even in an earthly

way it cannot be asserted with any proof that I have lost anything by taking the course that I took. I have a baby boy who will be two years old within a couple of weeks, and I have never seen that baby. It is quite possible that I never will see him. But, on the other hand, I may some day be a free man again and live happily with my family. I cannot be sure that had I gone to war and helped to kill others, all would have been well with my family. Arriving home from the war, I may have lost my wife and child through sickness. Or, I may have lost my dear mother, or some other loved one. Or, any one of a thousand misfortunes may have befallen me. So, although in prison for nearly twenty-seven months under conditions that have been none too desirable, nevertheless, as I remarked before it cannot be proved that I have suffered any earthly loss in consequence of my loyalty to God. Spiritually, I know for certain that I have pursued the most profitable course. We should serve God for His sake, and not for personal benefit.

I believe that I am justified in claiming that the military authorities indirectly caused the death of my brother Joe. Here is a case where I did lose a loved one in consequence of my stand; at least, it seems that my being in prison and the manner in which the military authorities at Fort Leavenworth treated Joe was indirectly the cause of his dying while quite young, aged 28. Joe and I were great pals, it was hard to lose him. We were greater chums through life than my older brother and myself, not because I loved Joe more than I did John, but circumstances brought Joe and me together more. We went to school together for some years after John had quit school and had gone to work. Later in life Joe and I worked in the same railroad office. After work we chummed together, seldom went with girls, he was my girl, I was his girl, and we had very little other time for any other sweetheart. Joe understood me quite well, while a great many people did not understand me. You see it is quite hard to understand a person who is criminally insane. Well, anyway, I had convictions and I tried to live according to those convictions. I was an agitator, most friends could not understand why I would waste opportunities in pursuit of an ideal, but Joe understood. He helped me to organize the Railway Clerk's Union in Denver. Then came a little break in our close relationship. I was fired, but, for some reason, Joe was allowed to hang on to his job. Our evenings though were spent together. I really idolized Joe, he was a superior young man, a man of high ideals, a far better man than me in every way, and I could follow where he led. I wish I could be as good as he was. I will never forget how disconsolately I wept all night long in solitary confinement, the night I learned of his death. But after a night of bitter weeping, I began to realize how wrong it was to mourn his passing. I do believe that Joe was a saint, he was now enjoying his eternal reward, why selfishly wish him back?

Joe was working in California as icing agent for the Santa Fe in Bakersfield at the time that I was drafted. At his first opportunity he got a vacation, and, after visiting at our home in Denver for a few days, he came east. On December 13, 1918, I was put in solitary confinement. I did not know beforehand -- not long enough beforehand -- so I could not let Joe

know. On December 14, he called to visit me. Both of us had been looking forward to this visit for two months. Each day of those two months seemed like an age. Finally the appointed time had arrived. But I was in solitary confinement. They let me know that Joe had called to visit me, but would not let him visit. It must have been hard on him, much harder than on me, for he had come 3,000 miles to see me, had anticipated a long and enjoyable visit, then, at the last minute, was disappointed. It was a severe blow to me. I felt for a while as if the strain would drive me to do violence to the man whom I considered mainly responsible, viz: Col. Rice, the commandant of the prison. I studied the matter over thoroughly, and afterwards thanked God once again for religion, for if unrestrained by religious impulses nothing could have kept me from seeking opportunity and murdering Col. Rice so acute was my reaction to his merciless attitude.

Yes, it must have been hard on Joe. It is so much harder on those outside. I know how I would feel if I had a loved one in prison under such circumstances or any other circumstances. Joe went to Chicago to visit our cousin. Captain Miller called me up to headquarters, showed me a letter that Joe had written asking if he would be permitted to visit me providing he made another trip to Fort Leavenworth on his way home. I was informed that, unless I would go to work, Joe could not see me. I would not go to work, for reasons previously stated. Joe came anyway. How many trips he made to the prison I do not know. I have learned that the last time he went there, there was a streetcar men's strike, and he had to walk several miles through a blizzard, but he was determined to see me if possible. It was Christmas Eve, and the heart of the executive officer seemed moved to do a good turn on that eventful day, so he allowed Joe to visit with me for ten minutes. I was not allowed to come out of the dungeon, Joe was taken down there. It was with difficulty that he checked the tears, and I experienced the same trouble. At first the executive officer -- who accompanied Joe to the dungeons -- would not permit us to shake hands, but he finally rescinded that order. In ten minutes we could not say much, but Joe offered to give up his good position in California and get any kind of a job in Kansas City where he would be near to me and could visit me and help me. I tried to dissuade him, assuring him that I would be out soon, and that it was best for him not to give up a really good position. Our ten minutes was up, he was taken away, and he promised to come again soon, although he said the weather was so cold and stormy that he may not be up for a while.

Each day I looked for him, but as the weather continued to remain inclement I decided that that was the cause of his not coming. Several days passed. Then I really did think he would come almost any minute, the weather was clearing now, and surely he would be here soon. Thus I mused all day long. I was now in solitary confinement in the Post Guard House, having been removed from the main prison on December 26. And, as my fourteen days on bread and water had been served, I was now allowed to receive mail in addition to full diet. Glancing over the paper from home I read that my brother Joe had died. It was a terrible feeling. I later learned

that my folks did not telegraph me because they believed the shock would be too much for me. My sister wrote a letter telling of Joe's illness, then she wrote another letter telling of his death. The letters were so consoling, and, had I not accidentally learned of Joe's death by reading of it in the newspaper, the manner in which my dear sister wrote to me would have saved me much pain and sorrow.

Soon as I read about Joe in the paper, I got in touch with the executive officer, asked for a furlough long enough to enable me to go to Denver, remain there 48 hours and return. I agreed to pay my fare and expenses and the fare and expenses of two guards. All my entreaties were vain; there was nothing to do but to weep in the solitude of solitary confinement. I was so anxious to attend the funeral, not alone in order to get a last look upon the face of one I dearly loved, but more particularly that I might help to console my darling mother and the others of my loved ones. But I was a slacker and a coward, such trash are not entitled to any rights.

When Joe first came to visit me on December 14, the weather was mild and balmy, just like a spring day. And it was quite pleasant for a few days after the 14th. Then we began to have storms. The day he was allowed to see me was one of the stormiest of that period. He could not get any medical attention in Kansas City, and due to a shortage in fuel the hotel room was inadequately heated -- in fact it was cold. But, despite his severe attack, Joe stayed in Kansas city hoping to get well, for he apparently had determined to ignore my request that he keep his job in California, and it seems that he made up his mind to go to work in Kansas City where he would be near to me so that he could try to help me. A few days passed, he could stand it no longer, started for home, and he died ten days after the day upon which we bid each other good-bye. If ever there was a martyr, Joe was one.

Had Joe been allowed to visit me on December 14, it is likely he would have gone on to Chicago and then home. Or, even if he did return to Kansas City where he would be near to me, he would not attempt to make that trip on foot to Fort Leavenworth when the weather was so bad. Too, all of the time from the 14th of December on, he would have had an easier mind, he would have seen me, had a chat with me, and there would not have been the anxiety and its consequent physical enervation.

Moreover, if I had not been in prison, Joe might be alive and well today. But, does that prove that either Joe or I or any member of our family has suffered because I obeyed God's commandment and Christ's teaching and refused to go to war? Not at all. Joe died a holy, happy, peaceful death. And he was game -- as he was all through life. When mother told him that he was going to die and asked him if he were afraid to die, he said: "Not at all; I am ready to die; I've got to die some time, and if God wants me now I am ready to go." Then he made all funeral arrangements. A couple of days later, after receiving the Last Sacraments for the

second time, he passed on to his eternal reward. My sister wrote to me that "he died as he lived, happily, cheerfully."

Our family has no assurance that if I had been a free man that Joe would be alive today. He might be, he might not be. It is possible that, had events happened differently from what I have related, Joe might have died on the same day anyway, and he might have died an agonizing death, and away from home, and without the Last Sacraments. On the other hand, had I taken part in war, Joe may have lived and with me he may have suffered many illnesses, many misfortunes in consequence of my wrong-doing. We have no way of ascertaining. But one thing is certain: one will lose nothing, either temporally or spiritually, if one is loyal to God, obeys His commands, and lives according to the sublime exhortations of Jesus Christ.

The next proposition that we will consider in that "self-preservation" argument that the priest gave to my brother John, which argument we are considering in connection with the sending of the destroyers for an unknown Mediterranean cruise starting September 8, 1920, is: "Seek ye therefore first the kingdom of God, and His justice, and all these things shall be added unto you. Be not solicitous for to morrow: for the morrow will be solicitous for itself. Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof." These words, you will remember, I quoted once before from the sixth chapter of Matthew, but I have not yet stated their relation with the subject under consideration, which I will do now.

To seek the kingdom of God one must observe His laws. I have offered some evidence, and will offer more, to prove that affairs military are violations of His laws. In addition to seeking the kingdom of God, Christ tells us to seek also "justice." In the third chapter of the Epistle of St. James the Apostle, we are told: "And the fruit of justice is sown in peace."⁵ Not anywhere in the New Testament will you find where the fruit of justice is sown in war. In the same chapter of the same Epistle from which I have just quoted, St. James tells us: "For where envying and contention is, there is inconstancy, and every evil work." Who will say that war is not contention? You will remember the Webster's dictionary informs us that war is a contention at arms. Following what I have just quoted, St. James goes on to say: "The wisdom, that is from above, first indeed is chaste, then peaceable, modest, easy to be persuaded, consenting to the good, full of mercy and good fruits, without judging, without dissimulation." Our churchmen and our patrioteers would surely put St. James in the cooler if the latter were alive and preaching his seditious doctrine today. Listen to what this disloyalist says in the chapter previous to the one that I have been quoting from: "And whosoever shall keep the whole law, but offend in one point, is become guilty of all. For he that said Thou shalt not commit adultery, said also, Thou shalt not kill. Now if thou do not commit adultery, but shalt kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law." Poor St. James! He was a

Pages 65 - 66

Missing, presumed lost, according to Princeton University Library.

term "a just war." I feel indebted to three Catholic gentlemen for being able to present the views of those who oppose me. I tried and tried to get the Catholic Encyclopedia, but it is hard to get hold of any books when one is in an insane asylum, that is, it is hard to get particular books. Mr. McCann, one of the attendants and guards at my place of confinement, and Messers Fiehly and Kelly who are secretaries for the Knights of Columbus, came to my rescue, and, after a great deal of effort on their part, I now have the book. This book is known as volume 15 of the Catholic Encyclopedia. I will quote from pages 546, 547, 548, 549 and 550 on the question of war. What I will quote was written by Rev. Charles Macksey, S. J., Professor of Ethics and Natural Right, Gregorian University, Rome. The quotation is quite long, but I will state it in full for it will be about the most useful statement of all that has been quoted or will be quoted in opposition to the stand against war that I am trying to vindicate. In disputing Father Macksey's justification of a "just war," bear in mind that I am acting within my rights. As I stated before, Catholics are duty bound to believe only ex cathedra expounded doctrines. Later on, I will show, for purposes of analogy, where the Catholic Encyclopedia is wrong in the analogy that I will later cite. It is possible that it is also wrong on the question of war.

Read very carefully what Father Macksey has to say. It will require careful reading in order to get the full benefit of this good priest's argument. I want you to learn his side of the case, and I am anxious that you should understand every point he makes. As you read his lines though, do a little analyzing on your own initiative. Ask yourself whether his contentions square with what Christ said about Thou shalt not kill, about overcoming evil with good, about submitting to persecution for justice' sake, about forgiving our enemies, about being merciful, about not avenging ourselves for injuries done to us but leaving the matter of vengeance to God who will punish as He sees fit, and about loving our neighbors as ourselves. I will number each line of Father Macksey's argument so that, in afterwards answering it, I can easily refer you to the particular part that I am then answering. Concerning war, Father Macksey, whose opinion is recorded in the Catholic Encyclopedia as representing the views of the Catholic hierarchy -- but not an ex cathedra pronouncement -- says:

1. War, in its juridical sense, is a contention carried on by force
2. of arms between sovereign states, or communities having in
3. this regard the right of states. The term is often used for
4. civil strife, sedition, rebellion properly so called, or even
5. for the undertaking of a State to put down by force organized
6. bodies of outlaws, and in fact there is no other proper word
7. for the struggle as such; but as these are not juridically in
8. the same class with contentions of force between sovereign
9. states, the jurist may not so use the term. However, a people

10. in revolution, in the rare instance of an effort to
11. re-establish civil government which has practically vanished
12. from the community except in name, or to vitalize constitu-
13. tional rights reserved specifically or residuarily to the
14. people, is conceded to be in like juridical case with a State,
15. as far as protecting its fundamental rights by force of arms.
16. Grote insisted that war was a more or less continuous condi-
17. tion of conflict between those contending by force; and so
18. indeed it is; but even Grote, when seeking to determine the
19. grounds of right and wrong in such a condition, necessarily
20. moved the question back to the right to acts of force in
21. either contending party, and so justified the more accepted
22. juridical definition of a contest at arms between contending
23. states. The judicial condition of the contending parties to
24. the war is spoken of as a state of belligerency, while the
25. term war more properly applies to the series of hostile acts
26. of force exercised in the contention. To present here the
27. position of Catholic philosophy in this regard, it will be
28. convenient to discuss in sequence: I. The Existence of the
29. Right of War; II. Its Juridical Source; III. Its subject-
30. matter; VI. Its Term. - From these we may gather the idea of
31. a just war.
32. I. The Existence of The Right of war – The right of
33. war is the right of a sovereign state to wage a contention at
34. arms against another, and is in its analysis an instance of
35. the general moral power of coercion, i.e. to make use of
36. physical force to conserve its rights inviolable. Every
37. perfect right, i.e. every right involving in others an
38. obligation in justice of deference thereto, to be efficacious,
39. and consequently a real and not an illusory power, carries with
40. it at the last appeal the subsidiary right of coercion. A
41. perfect right, then, implies the right of physical force to
42. defend itself against infringement, to recover the subject-
43. matter of right unjustly withheld or to exact its equivalent,
44. and to inflict damage in the exercise of this coercion
45. wherever, as is almost universally the case, coercion cannot
46. be exercised effectively without such damage. The limitations
47. of this coercive right are: that its exercise be necessary; and
48. that damage be not inflicted beyond measure -- first of
49. necessity and secondly of proportion with the subject-matter of
50. right at issue. Furthermore, the exercise of coercion is
51. restricted in civil communities to the public authority, for the
52. reason that such restriction is a necessity of the common weal.
53. In like manner the use of force beyond the region of defense and
54. reparation, namely for the imposition of punishment to restore
55. the balance of retributive justice by compensation for the mere
56. violation of law and justice, as well as to assure the future
57. security of the same, is reserved to public authority, for the
58. reason that the State is the natural guardian of law and order,
59. and to permit the individual, even in a matter of personal offend-
60. ce, to be witness, judge, and executioner all at once -- human
61. nature being what it is -- would be a source of injustice
62. rather than of equitable readjustment.

63. Now the State has corporate rights of its own which
64. are perfect; it has also the duty to defend its citizens'
65. rights; it consequently has the right of coercion in safe-
66. guarding its own and its citizens' rights in case of menace
67. or violation from abroad as well as from at home, not only
68. against foreign individuals, but also against foreign states.
69. Otherwise the duty above indicated would be impossible of
70. fulfillment; the corporate rights of the State would be
71. nugatory, while the individual rights of citizens would be
72. at the mercy of the outside world. The pressure of such
73. coercion, it is true, may be applied in certain circumstances
74. without both parties going to the extreme of complete national
75. conflict; but when the latter arises, as it commonly will, we
76. have war pure and simple, even as the first application of
77. force is initial warfare. Catholic philosophy, therefore,
78. concedes to the State the full natural right of war, whether
79. defensive, as in case of another's attack in force upon it;
80. offensive – more properly, coercive, -- where it finds it
81. necessary to take the initiative in the application of force;
82. or punitive, in the infliction of punishment for evil done
83. against itself or, in some determined cases, against others.
84. International law views the punitive right of war with
85. suspicion; but, though it is open to wide abuse, its original
86. existence under the natural law cannot well be disputed.
87. II. The Source of The Right of War is the natural
88. law, which confers upon states, as upon individuals, the
89. moral powers or rights which are the necessary means to the
90. essential purpose set by the natural law for the individual
91. and the State to accomplish. Just as it is the natural law
92. which, with a view to the natural purposes of mankind's
93. creation, has granted its substantial rights to the state, so
94. it is the same law which concedes the subsidiary right of
95. physical coercion in their maintenance, without which none of
96. its rights would be efficacious. The full truth, however,
97. takes into consideration the limitations and extensions of
98. the war-right set by international law in virtue of contract
99. – either implicit in accepted custom or explicit in formal
100. compact -- among the nations which are party to international
101. legal obligation. But it must be noted that civilized nations,
102. in their effort to ameliorate the cruel conditions of warfare,
103. have sometimes consented to allow, as the less of two imminent
104. evils, that which is forbidden by the natural law. This is not
105. strictly a right, though it is often so denominated, but an
106. international toleration of a natural wrong. In the common
107. territorial or commercial ambitions of great powers there may
108. be an agreement of mutual toleration of what is pure and simple
109. moral wrong by virtue of the natural law, and that without the
110. excuse of it being a less evil than another to be avoided; in
111. this case the unrighteousness is still more evident, for the
112. toleration itself is wrong. The original determination of the
113. right of war comes from the law of nature only; consent of
114. mankind may manifest the existence of a phase of this law; it
115. does not constitute it.

116. The agreement of nations may surrender in common
117. a part of the full right and so qualify it; or it may tolerate
118. a limited abuse of it; but such agreement does not confer a
119. particle of the original right itself, nor can it take aught
120. of it away, except by the consent of the nations so deprived.
121. The usage of the better part of the world in such a matter may
122. be argued to bind all nations, but the argument does not
123. conclude convincingly. The decisions of American courts lean
124. toward the proposition of universal obligation: English
125. jurists are not so clearly or generally in its favor. Of
126. course, for that part of the international law bearing on war,
127. which may be justly said to be the natural law as binding na-
128. tions in their dealings with one another, the existence of which
129. is manifested by the common consent of mankind, there can be
130. no controversy: here the international law is but a name for a
131. part of the natural law. Suárez, it is true, is inclined to
132. seek the right of war as a means not precisely of defense, but
133. of reparation of right and of punishment of violation, from the
134. international law, on the ground that it is not necessary in
135. the nature of things that the power of such rehabilitation and
136. punishment should rest with the aggrieved state – though it
137. should be somewhere on earth – but that mankind has agreed to
138. the individual state method rather than by formation of an
139. international tribunal with adequate police powers. However,
140. the argument given above shows with fair clearness that the
141. power belongs to the aggrieved state, and that though it might
142. have entrusted, or may yet entrust, its exercise to an inter-
143. national arbiter, it is not bound so to do, nor has it done
144. so in the past save in some exceptional cases.

145. III. The Possessor Of The Right Of War. – The right
146. of war lies solely with the sovereign authority of the State.
147. As it flows from the efficacious character of other rights
148. in peril, the coercive right must belong to the possessor, or to
149. the natural guardian, of those rights. The rights in question
150. may be directly corporate rights of the State, of which, of
151. course, the State is itself the possessor, and of which there
152. is no natural guardian but the sovereign authority of the
153. State; or directly the rights of subordinate parts of the
154. State or even of its individual citizens, and of these the
155. sovereign authority is the natural guardian against foreign
156. aggression. The sovereign authority is the guardian, because
157. there is no higher power on earth to which appeal may be made;
158. and, moreover, in the case of the individual citizen, the
159. protection of his rights against foreign aggression will
160. ordinarily become indirectly a matter of the good of the
161. Commonwealth. It is clear that the right of war cannot become
162. a prerogative of any subordinate power in the state, or of a
163. section, a city, or an individual, for the several reasons:
164. that none such can have the right to imperil the good of all
165. the state – as happens in war -- except the juridical
166. guardian of the common good of all; that subordinate parts of
167. the state, as well as the individual citizen, having the

168. supreme authority of the state to which to make appeal, are
169. not in the case of necessity required for the exercise of
170. coercion; finally, that any such right in hands other than
171. those of the sovereign power would upset the peace and order
172. of the whole state. How sovereign authority in matter of
173. war reverts back to the people as a whole in certain circum-
174. stances belongs for explanation to the question of revolution.
175. With the supreme power lies also the judicial authority to
176. determine when war is necessary, and what is the necessary and
177. proportionate measure of damage it may therein inflict: there
178. is no other natural tribunal to which recourse may be had,
179. and without this judicial faculty the right of war would be
180. vain.

181. IV. The Title and Purpose of War. – The primary
182. title of a state to go to war is: first, the fact that the
183. state's rights – either directly or indirectly through those
184. of its citizens – are menaced by foreign aggression not
185. otherwise to be prevented than by war; secondly, the fact of
186. actual violation of right not otherwise reparable; thirdly,
187. the need of punishing the threatening or infringing power for
188. the security of the future. From the nature of the proved
189. right these three facts are necessarily just titles, and the
190. state, whose rights are in jeopardy, is itself the judge
191. thereof. Secondary titles may come to a state, first, from
192. the request of another state in peril – or of a people who
193. happen themselves to be in possession of the right – ;
194. secondly, from the fact of the oppression of the innocent,
195. whose unjust suffering is proportionate to the gravity of war
196. and whom it is impossible to rescue in any other way; in this
197. latter case the innocent have the right to resist, charity
198. calls for assistance, and the intervening state may justly
199. assume the communication of the right of the innocent to
200. exercise extreme coercion in their behalf. Whether a state
201. may find title to interfere for punishment after the destruc-
202. tion of the innocent who were in no wise its own subjects, is
203. not so clear, unless such punishment be a reasonable necessity
204. for the future security of its own citizens and their rights.
205. It has been argued that the extension of a state's punitive
206. right outside of the field of its own subjects would seem to
207. be a necessity of natural conditions; for the right must be
208. somewhere, if we are to have law and order on the earth, and
209. there is no place to put it except in the hands of the state
210. that is willing to undertake the punishment. Still, the
211. matter is not as clear as the right to interfere in defence
212. of the innocent.

213. The common good of the nation is a restricting condi-
214. tion upon the exercise of its right to go to war; but it is
215. not itself a sufficient title for such exercise. Thus the
216. mere expansion of trade, the acquisition of new territory,
217. however beneficial or necessary for a developing state, gives
218. no natural title to wage war upon another state to force that
219. trade upon her, or to extort a measure of her surplus terri-
220. tory, as the common good of one state, has no greater right

221. than the common good of another, and each is the judge and
222. guardian of its own. Much less may a just title be found in
223. the mere need of exercising a standing martial force, of
224. reconciling a people to the tax for its maintenance, or to
225. escape revolutionary trouble at home. Here, also, it is to
226. be noted that nations cannot draw a parallel from Old-
227. Testament titles. The Israelites lived under a theocracy;
228. God, as Supreme Lord of all the earth, in specific instances,
229. by the exercise of His supreme dominion, transferred the
230. ownership of alien lands to the Israelites; by His command
231. they waged war to obtain possession of it, and their title
232. to war was the ownership (thus given to them) of the land for
233. which they fought. The privation thus wrought upon its prior
234. owners and actual possessors had, moreover, the character of
235. punishment visited upon them by God's order for offences
236. committed against Him. No state can find such title exist-
237. ing for itself under the natural law.

238. Furthermore, a clear title is limited to the condition
239. that war is necessary as a last appeal. Hence, if there is
240. reasonable ground to think that the offending state will
241. withdraw its menace, repair the injury done, and pay a penalty
242. sufficient to satisfy retributive justice and give a fair
243. guarantee of the future security of juridical order between the
244. two states concerned -- all in consequence of proper represen-
245. tation, judicious diplomacy, patient urgency, a mere threat of
246. war, or any other just means this side of actual war -- then
247. war itself cannot as yet be said to be a necessity, and so, in
248. such premises, lacks full title. A fair opportunity of
249. adjustment must be given, or a reasonable assurance had that
250. the offence will not be rectified except under stress of war,
251. before the title is just. Whether the aggrieved state should
252. consent to arbitrate differences of judgment before resorting
253. to war, is within its own competency to decide, as the natural
254. law has established no judge but the aggrieved state itself,
255. and international law does not constrain it to transfer its
256. judicial right to any other tribunal, except in so far forth
257. as it has by prior agreement bound itself so to do. None the
258. less, when the grievance is not clear, and the public author-
259. ity has sound reason to think that it can arrange for a tribunal
260. where justice will be done, it would seem that the necessity of
261. war in that individual case is not final, and even though inter-
262. national law may leave the state free to refuse all arbitra-
263. tion, the natural law would seem to commend if not to command
264. it. Towards this solution of international differences, in
265. spite of the difficulty of securing an unbiased tribunal, we
266. have in the last fifty years made some progress.

267. Again, the question of proportion between the damages
268. to be inflicted by war and the value of the national right
269. menaced or violated must enter into consideration for the
270. determination of the full justice of a title. Here we must
271. take into account the consequences of such right being left
272. unvindicated. Nations are prone to go to war for almost any
273. violation of right, and its reparation absolutely refused.

274. This tendency argues the common conviction that such violation
275. will go from bad to worse, and that, if sovereign right is not
276. recognized in a small thing, it will be far less so in a great.
277. The conviction is not without rational ground; and yet the
278. pride of power and the sensitiveness of national vanity
279. can readily lead, in the excitement of the moment, to a mistaken
280. judgment of a gravity of offence proportionate to all the ills
281. of war. Neither is force a successful means of securing honor,
282. unless it be to assure the due recognition of the rights of
283. the sovereign power behind that honor; while in the calm forum
284. of deliberate reason the loss of one human life outweighs the
285. mere offended vanity of a king or a people. The true proportion
286. between the damage to be inflicted and the right violated is to
287. be measured by whether the loss of right in itself or in its
288. ordinary natural consequences would be morally as great a
289. detriment to the common good of the state aggrieved as the
290. damages which war conducted against the aggressor would entail
291. upon the common good of the same, throwing into the balance
292. against the latter the additional amount of damage due him as
293. the punishment of retributive justice. Finally, a state going
294. to war must weigh its own probable losses in blood and treasure,
295. and its prospect of victory, before it may rightly enter upon a
296. war: for the interests of the common good at home inhibit the
297. exercise of force abroad, unless reasonably calculated not to
298. be an ultimate graver loss to one's own community. This is not
299. properly a limitation of title, but a prudential limitation
300. upon the exercise of a right in the face of full title. The
301. proper purpose of war is indicated by the title, and war
302. conducted for a purpose beyond that contained in a just title
303. is a moral wrong.
304. V. The Subject-Matter Of The Right Of War. --This will
305. cover what may be done by the warring power in exercise of its
306. right. It embraces the infliction of all manner of damage to
307. property and life of the other state and its contending
308. subjects, up to the measure requisite to enforce submission,
309. implying the acceptance of a final readjustment and proportion-
310. ate penalty; it includes in general all acts that are
311. necessary means to such damage, but is checked by the proviso
312. that neither the damage inflicted nor the means taken involve
313. actions that are intrinsically immoral. In the prosecution of
314. the war the killing or injuring of non-combatants (women,
315. children, the aged and feeble, or even those capable of bearing
316. arms but as a matter of fact not in any way participating in
317. the war) is consequently barred, except where their simultaneous
318. destruction is an unavoidable accident attending the attack upon
319. the contending force. The wanton destruction of the property
320. of such non-combatants, where it does not or will not minister
321. maintenance or help to the state or its army, is likewise devoid
322. of the requisite condition of necessity. In fact the wanton
323. destruction of the property of the state or of combatants --
324. i.e. where such destruction cannot make for their submission,
325. reparation, or proportionate punishment -- is beyond the pale
326. of the just subject-matter of war. The burning of the Capitol

327. and White House at Washington in 1814, and the devastation of
328. Georgia, South Carolina, and the Valley of the Shenandoah
329. during the American Civil War have not escaped criticism in
330. this category. That "war is hell", in the sense that it
331. inevitably carries with it a maximum of human miseries, is true;
332. in the sense that it justifies anything that makes for the
333. suffering and punishment of a people at war, it cannot be
334. ethically maintained. The defence, that it hastens the close of
335. war through sympathy with the increased suffering even of non-
336. combatants, will not stand. The killing of the wounded or
337. prisoners, who thereby have ceased to be combatants, and have
338. rendered submission, is not only no necessity, but beyond the
339. limits of right because of submission, while common charity
340. requires that they be properly cared for.
341. A doubt might arise about the obligation to spare
342. wounded and prisoners, the guardianship or care of whom would
343. prevent immediate further prosecution of the war at perhaps its
344. most auspicious moment, or their dismissal but replenish the
345. forces of the enemy. The care of the wounded might be waived,
346. as its obligation is not of justice but of charity, which
347. yields to a superior claim of one's own benefit: but the
348. killing of prisoners presents a different problem. All
349. practical doubt in the matter has been removed among civilized
350. nations by the agreements of international law. The canons of
351. the natural law of necessity and proportion this side the limit
352. of intrinsic moral wrong are so hard of application by the
353. contending forces that the history of wars is full of excesses;
354. hence international law has steadily moved towards hard and
355. fast lines that will lessen the waste of human life and the
356. miseries of warfare. Thus the use of ammunition causing
357. excessive destruction of human life or excessive suffering,
358. incurable wounds, or human defacement beyond the requirements
359. for putting the combatants out of the conflict and so winning
360. a battle are excluded by international agreement based upon
361. the obvious limitation of the natural law. Poisoning, as
362. imperilling the innocent beyond measure, and assassination, as
363. associated with treachery and the personal assumption of the
364. right of life and death (to say nothing of its want of a fair
365. opportunity of defence and the cowardice commonly implied
366. therein), have met with common condemnation, thus closing the
367. loophole of obscurity in the natural law. The natural law is
368. clear enough, however, in condemning as intrinsically immoral
369. lying and the direct deception of another, as well as bad faith
370. and treachery. The phrase, "All is fair in love and war",
371. cannot be taken seriously; it is a loose by-word taken from the
372. reckless practices of men, and runs counter to right reason,
373. natural law, and justice. No end justifies an immoral means,
374. and lying, perjury, bad faith, treachery, as well as the direct
375. slaughter of the innocent, wanton destruction, and the lawless
376. pillage and outrage of cruder times, are, as far as the worst
377. of them go, a thing of the past among civilized nations. That
378. states are not always nice in conscience about lying, deceit,
379. and bad faith in war as in diplomacy is occasionally a fact

380. today; and the defence of lying and deceit in the stratagems
381. of war, where good faith or common convention is not violated,
382. is a sequence of the erroneous doctrine of Grote that lying
383. is not intrinsically immoral, but only wrong in as far as those
384. with whom we deal have a right to demand the truth of us;
385. but as such teaching is almost unanimously repudiated in
386. Catholic philosophy, the practice has today in Catholic thought
387. no ethical advocate. The hanging of spies, though commonly said
388. to be merely a measure of menace against a peculiar peril of
389. war, would seem to have behind it a remote suggestion of pun-
390. ishment of a form of deceit which is intrinsically wrong.

391. In the terms of readjustment after victory, the
392. victorious state, if its cause was just, may exact full repara-
393. tion of the original injustice suffered, full compensation for
394. all its own losses by reason of the war, proportionate penalty
395. to secure the future not only against the conquered state,
396. but, through fear of such penalty, even against other possibly
397. hostile states. In the execution of such judgment the killing
398. of surviving contestants or their enslavement, though, absolutely
399. speaking, these might fall within the measure of just punish-
400. ment, would today seem to be an extreme penalty, and the prac-
401. tice of civilization has abolished it. Here we are confronted
402. with the appalling destruction of the vanquished in the Old-
403. Testament wars, where frequently all the adult males were
404. slain after defeat and surrender, and sometimes even the
405. women and children, unto utter extermination. But we cannot
406. argue natural right from these instances, for, where justly
407. done, this wholesale slaughter was the direct command of God,
408. the Sovereign Arbiter of life and death, as well as the Just
409. Judge of all reward and punishment. God by revelation made
410. the Israelites but executioners of His supernatural sentence:
411. the penalty was within God's right to assign, and within the
412. Israelites' communicated right to enforce. The natural law
413. man the right to no such measure. The appropriation of a part
414. of the territory of the vanquished may quite readily be a
415. necessity of payment for reparation of injury and loss, and
416. even the entire subjection of the conquered state, as a part
417. of, or tributary to, its conqueror, may possibly fall within
418. the proportionate requirements for full reparation or for fu-
419. ture security, and, if so, such subjection is within the
420. competency of the last adjudication. The history of nations,
421. however, would indicate that this exaction was enforced far
422. oftener than it was justified by proportionate necessity.

423. VI. The Term Of The Right Of War is the nation against
424. which war can justly be waged. It must be juridically in the
425. wrong, i.e. it must have violated a perfect right of another
426. state, or at least be involved in an attempt at such violation.
427. Such a perfect right is one based upon strict justice between
428. states, and so grounding an obligation in justice in the state
429. against which war is to be waged. Here there is call for a
430. distinction between the obligation of an ethical and a juridi-
431. cal duty. A juridical duty supposes a right in another which

432. is violated by the state's neglect to fulfil that duty; not
433. so a merely ethical duty, for this is one proceeding from some
434. other foundation than justice, and so implies no right in
435. another which is violated by the non-fulfillment of the duty.
436. The foundation of the right of war is a right violated or
437. threatened, not a mere ethical duty neglected. No State,
438. any more than an individual, may use violence to enforce its
439. neighbor's performance of the latter. Hence a
440. foreign state may have a duty to develop its resources not
441. for its own immediate or particular need alone, but out of
442. universal comity to help the prosperity of other states, for
443. one community is bound to another by charity as are individuals;
444. but there is in another state no right to that development
445. founded in justice. To assume that one state has the right
446. to make war upon another to force it to develop its own
447. resources is to assume that each state holds its possessions in
448. trust for the human race at large, with a strict right to
449. share in its usufruct inhering in each other state in particular –
450. an assumption that yet awaits proof. So, too, the need of one
451. state of more territory for its overplus of population gives it
452. no right to seize the superabundant and undeveloped territory
453. of another. In the case of extreme necessity, parallel to
454. that of a starving man, where there is not other remedy except
455. forced sale or seizure of the territory in question, there
456. would be something upon which to base an argument, and the case
457. may be conceived, but seems far from arising. Similarly, a
458. government's neglect of a juridical duty towards its own
459. people of itself gives no natural right to a foreign state to
460. interfere, save only in the emergency, extreme and rare enough,
461. where the people would have the right of force against its
462. government and by asking aid from abroad would communicate in
463. part the exercise of this coercive right to the succoring
464. power. Lastly, in the case of a state's wholesale persecution
465. of the innocent with death or unjust enslavement, a foreign
466. power taking up their cause may fairly be said reasonably to
467. assume the call of these and to make use of their right of
468. resistance.
469. In conclusion, a war, to be just, must be waged by a
470. sovereign power for the security of a perfect right of its own
471. (or of another justly invoking its protection) against foreign
472. violation in a case where there is no other means available to
473. secure or repair the right; and must be conducted with a
474. moderation which, in the continuance and settlement of the
475. struggle, commits no act intrinsically immoral, nor exceeds in
476. damage done, or in payment and in penalty exacted, the measure
477. of necessity and of proportion to the value of the right
478. involved, the cost of the war, and the guarantee of future
479. security.

That I may dissect Father Macksey's dissertation on war while it is fresh in our minds, I will defer citing, by way of analogy, my authority to question what, outside the realm of ex cathedra pronouncements, is taught by Catholic clergy. I will,

however, after answering Father Macksey, produce ample evidence of the right and the duty to question the clergy when facts warrant such action. Because I differ with the clergy on the issue of war, does not mean that I am wanting in due respect for their high office. May God grant that my reverence for His holy priesthood will never grow cold.

In the first place, I would like to make a general statement about Father Macksey's treatise on war. Since reading it, I believe that you will agree that Father has fairly well justified every war in history; not everything that the participants did, but the declaration and prosecution of the war up to the limits of its prosecution that he defined. And, if I were a maker of wars, and an instigator, such as profiteers are, I am sure that Father Macksey's statement on the question of war would soothe my conscience, because the reasons that he assumes justify war are almost continuously present in society.

Having quoted Father Macksey word for word, which gives you the benefit of having his argument presented in its entirety, I will now begin to answer him, and, although it will tend to consume a great number of pages, still I wish, when necessary, to re-quote his statements and then answer them. Even though it requires considerable time, it will be time well spent, for Father Macksey's treatise on war not only brands my attitude as savoring of "defective judgment" but, which is almost infinitely worse, also helps to defend the use of Christian youths as cannon fodder, wrecks homes and ruins nations, leads people astray, and causes them to disobey God. Read the evidence that I have to produce, then decide whether war is Christian or anti-Christian. And, bear in mind that I am not presenting my views as the fundamental basis of my argument is concerned, but producing the testimony of Christ. Permit me, even though repeating, to again call your attention to the fact that Christ did not contradict Himself. If anything that I quote from Him -- and the same is true of His apostles -- convinces you that things military are unchristian, then if you would save your own soul and help to save the souls of others, your duty is clear.

In the beginning, Father Macksey defines war. Agreed. He uses the term "state" and "states" throughout, which is perfectly correct, but we are accustomed to speaking of a group of states as a nation or a country, so I will use the term "nation" or "nations" in place of the term "state" or "states" as Father Macksey did.

From line 1 to line 32, Father merely defined war. Having no dispute concerning his definition of war, we will proceed.

Line 32: "The right of war is the right of a sovereign state to wage a contention at arms against another, and is in its analysis an instance of the general moral power of coercion, i.e. to make use of physical force to conserve its rights inviolable."

Answer: If by the word "moral" he means what

is right as opposed to immoral and wrong, then we must determine whether it is right or moral, to coerce, by the use of physical force, those persons or nations who have transgressed our rights. If a Christian cannot consistently use physical force coercively in the conservation of his rights, then, from the Christian viewpoint, there is no such animal as "moral power of coercion."

Christ's repudiation of the "eye for an eye and tooth for a tooth" doctrine, substituting therefore the philosophy of love, and urging: "but if one strike thee on thy right cheek, turn to him also the other," seems to negate the proposal of using "physical force to conserve" the rights of a nation. For Christ did not propose that his doctrine should become the rule of life only when people were dealing with each other as individuals. He also meant it to be applied in collective transaction, i.e. when nations are dealing with nations -- groups of people with groups of people -- they are bound by the Law of God. If not, they could break all His commandments with impunity, provided they did so in herds.

In the two last verses of the last chapter of St. Matthew, Christ is recorded as having told His disciples: "Going therefore, teach ye all nations; ... Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."

There is a footnote in the Catholic Bible, referring to the matter of turning the other cheek, and the footnote tells us that the exhortation does not oblige according to the letter, as neither Christ nor St. Paul turned the other cheek. Quite true, but this figure of speech that Christ used makes his doctrine plain. Certainly if Christ advocated the use of physical force as a coercive measure in conserving our rights, He would not have admonished that we "turn the other cheek." Immediately following His plea that we "turn the other cheek," Christ tells us, as I stated once before: "And if a man will contend with thee in judgment and take away thy coat, let go thy cloak also unto him. And whosoever will force thee one mile, go with him the other two." This certainly runs counter to using physical force to conserve our rights. And, to repeat, it applies to nations as well as individuals, for nations are merely groups of individuals. Moreover, in national disputes we lack the excuse of even saving our property, for wars are hatched in secret by intriguing diplomats, then we are arbitrarily ordered to go forth and slay our fellow men. The queer part of the whole affair is that each side in the battle has "inviolable rights" that it is attempting to conserve. I am reminded of the poem on The Five Souls, written by W. N. Ever, and first published in The Nation (London, England). It reads:

I was a peasant of the Polish plain,
I left my plough because the message ran --
Russia in danger, needed every man,
To save her from the Teuton -- and was slain.
I gave my life for freedom, this I know,
For those who bade me fight had told me so.
(continued on next page)

I was a Tyrolese, a mountaineer.
I gladly left my mountain home to fight
Against the brutal, treacherous Muscovite --
And died in Poland on a Cossack spear.
I gave my life for freedom, this I know,
For those who bade me fight had told me so.

I worked in Lyons at my weaver's loom,
When suddenly the Prussian despot hurled
His felon blow at France, and at the world;
Then I went forth to Belgium -- and my doom.
I gave my life for freedom, this I know,
For those who bade me fight had told me so.

I owned a vineyard by the wooded Main,
Until the Fatherland, begirt by foes,
Lusting her downfall, called me, and I rose
Swift to the call -- and died in fair Lorraine.
I gave my life for freedom, this I know,
For those who bade me fight had told me so.

I labored in a shipyard by the Clyde;
There came a sudden word of war's declared,
Of Belgium peaceful, helpless, unprepared,
Asking our aid, I joined the ranks -- and died.
I gave my life for freedom, this I know,
For those who bade me fight had told me so.

We have reached line 36, where Father Macksey says: "Every perfect right, i.e. every right involving in others an obligation in justice of deference thereto, to be efficacious, and consequently a real and not illusory power, carries with it at the last appeal the subsidiary right of coercion."

Answer: Suppose for illustration that we define "every perfect right" as Father has put it, to mean liberty. I believe it was John Stuart Mill who gave the following definition of liberty: "My liberty ends where yours begins." Now, if I make any inroads upon your liberty, I am violating one of your rights, and, conversely, if you overstep the bounds of your liberty, -- for instance: if you injure me personally or destroy my property, or the country that you are in unjustifiably makes war upon the country that I am in -- then you are transgressing a right that, to use Father Macksey's terms, "involves in you an obligation in justice of deference thereto." Perhaps Father will contend that it must first be proved that you are treating me wrongly or that your country's war upon me is unjustifiable. Did you ever meet a person who had been the victim of physical violence, and who claimed his assailant did the right thing? Have you ever known a country that was warred upon, and that justified the invaders?

Now, Father Macksey's declaration is to the effect that, since I have rights, those rights carry with them "at the last appeal the subsidiary right of coercion" in order that the powers inherent in those rights may be real and not illusory.

In other words he advises that we use Christ's rule of overcoming evil with good up to a point that he terms "last appeal," and when that point is reached we must discard the Bible and resort to the "moral power of coercion" as he calls it. Father Macksey's line of thought is clear enough to me, but the puzzling part of the situation is that Christ advocated the weapon of love unconditionally.

Father Macksey and President Wilson make a good team. You remember how Christianly the president handled the situation up to a certain point. But, he seemed to have his eye on that "last appeal" station, and when the Ship of State steamed into port he tossed Christianity overboard. On the 12th of November, 1917, our dear president said in a speech at Buffalo: "What I am opposed to is not the feelings of the pacifists, but their stupidity. My heart is with them, but my mind has a contempt for them. I want peace, but I know how to get it and they do not." Then, imparting full knowledge of his recipe for peace, Wilson the Christian tells us "Force; force to the utmost; force without stint or limit."

Edward T. Devine, writing in the Survey of November 16, 1918, in an exultant spirit proclaimed: "The war is won. All wars are at an end. This was a war to end wars, and it is victoriously finished." Within less than five months after Mr. Devine's prophecy, war was raging on no less than twenty-four European battlefronts. The disciples of force seem to have another guess coming. Wilson changed his mind once; he changed from Christianity to barbarianism; it might not be a bad idea to change it again and this time try "Christianity; Christianity to the utmost; Christianity without stint or limit." Unless Christ was an impostor, his method will succeed where physical coercion has failed.

Beginning with line 40, Father Macksey tells us: "A perfect right, then, implies the right of physical force to defend itself against infringement, to recover the subject-matter of right unjustly withheld or to exact its equivalent, and to inflict damage in the exercise of this coercion wherever, as is almost universally the case, coercion cannot be exercised effectively without such damage. The limitations of this coercive right are: that its exercise be necessary; and that damage be not inflicted beyond measure -- first of necessity and secondly of proportion with the subject-matter of right at issue."

Answer: He has made it clearer than ever that his idea is to use physical force in the defense of our rights, and to inflict damage when necessary. Having previously shown that Christ advocated kindness, tolerance, good-will, love, and "turning the other cheek" in place of the use of physical force, let us see what He says in the seventh chapter of Matthew: "Judge not, that you may not be judged. For with what judgment you judge, you shall be judged: and with what measure you mete, it shall be measured to you again." If we are wronged, if our rights are trampled upon, we must not judge our adversary and punish him according to our decision as to what damage it is necessary to inflict, but, according to Christ, we must meekly

endure the wrong and return good for evil. No, this is not the cowardly way; it takes a real man to act thusly; it takes a genuine Christian to place more reliance upon the efficacy of Christ's weapons than upon the potency of his own or his country's physical strength. I have just quoted Christ as having said: "with what measure you mete, it shall be measured to you again." Can anything aside from Father Macksey's inconsistency as a Christian be plainer than this declaration of the Master? Put into other words, our divine Lord said that if we mete out injury in return for injury, then we shall receive injury in return; but, if we do good to those who trample upon our rights, then we shall receive good in return.

Father Macksey attached an unfortunate safety clutch to the statement that I just previously quoted; that is, the safety clutch was unfortunate for his argument. He said: "The limitations of this coercive right are: that its exercise be necessary, etc." In the light of this phrase, the dark night of militarism disappears before the rising Sun of Christianity. The exercise of "coercive right" is never necessary, because, as has been proved by those who tried it and will be demonstrated to those who are brave enough to make it the rule of life, light always overcomes darkness, good always overcomes evil, and God is always victorious over the Devil. Of course God will not vanquish the Devil if we ride to battle in the Devil's chariot, but, if we align ourselves with the Good Spirit within us and allow nothing to alienate us, then, just as surely as light dispels darkness, we will overpower the Devil in ourselves and in our neighbors.

We have now reached line 50 in Father Macksey's insurance policy for the profiteers. I give it this name because, if we were to be guided by it, munitions manufacturers -- many if not most of whom profess to be Christians -- could sleep well at night regardless of the One whose judgment was so defective that it became necessary to crucify Him in order to suppress His seditious teachings. It is illuminating to observe how "force without stint or limit" put an end to Christianity. "Force to the utmost" was surely used in the case of Christ, but "truth crushed to earth will rise again."⁶ I must, however, get back to that insurance policy. From line 50 to line 62, Father Macksey points out that the individual must not usurp the authority of the state in "the exercise of coercion." Since I claim that it is wrong for either Christian individuals or Christian nations to resort to the use of physical coercion, it will be unnecessary to discuss the question of an individual usurping the authority of a state in this matter.

Lines 63 to 77 read: "Now the State has corporate rights of its own which are perfect; it has also the duty to defend its citizens' rights; it consequently has the right of coercion in safeguarding its own and its citizens' rights in case of menace or violation from abroad as well as from at home, not only against foreign individuals, but also against foreign states. Otherwise the duty above indicated would be impossible of fulfillment; the

corporate rights of the State would be nugatory, while the individual rights of citizens would be at the mercy of the outside world. The pressure of such coercion, it is true, may be applied in certain circumstances without both parties going to the extreme of complete national conflict; but when the latter arises, as it commonly will, we have war pure and simple, even as the first application of force is initial warfare."

Answer: I admit that the State has corporate rights of its own; and that it has also the duty to defend its citizens' rights. But, from the Christian viewpoint, the aforementioned facts do not give it "the right of coercion," for, as Father Macksey has made clear, he means by coercion the use of "physical force" to the extent of inflicting necessary damage. "Damage" and "coercion" and "physical force" or any of their equivalents are terms that Christ never used except for the purpose of condemning resort thereto. Father Macksey's statement: "Otherwise the duty above indicated would be impossible of fulfillment" is not true. What he meant to say was that if you rely upon the use of physical force for the settlement of wrongs, then you must without fail adopt physical force in safeguarding your own or your country's rights. But, all history proves that "physical force" does not "safeguard." Quite frequently the side most in error is victorious in battle; and even when the side that participated with the greatest amount of justification, wins, that does not mean that wrongs were righted; it means only a conquest of arms, forcing the other side to submit, but does not alter their thoughts concerning the issues at stake. Moreover, as Christ warned, the damage that you do "shall be measured to you again," in one form or another. When I referred to the "greatest amount of justification" I did not wish to imply that either side was justified in the use of warfare, but I was merely assuming that, viewed by neutrals, one side had more right to go to war than the other side had. From the Christian standpoint, however, neither side is doing the right thing.

So I claim, with the testimony of Christ as a witness, that it is possible for a State to fulfill its duty of protecting its own and its citizen's rights without resort to threats or violence. All that is required: "Overcome evil with good." And, to repeat: if such is impossible, Christianity is a myth.

It must be evident to you, as it is to me, that I am indulging in considerable repetition. I believe, however, that it is worthwhile repetition. I believe that it would pay us well if we would take a certain passage of Holy Writ each day and repeat it over and over again, noticing how it applies to every phase of our daily lives.

Father Macksey says that by the State's failure to rely upon the coercive use of physical force, the individual rights of its citizens would be at the mercy of the outside world. It is reliance upon the coercive use of physical force that has increased, rather than minimized the danger. William Penn did not rely upon physical force, he put his faith in God, and, in place of his

colonists being at the mercy of the Indians, they were the only group of settlers that were immune from attack. The colonists surrounding Penn's settlement relied upon physical force, with the result that they were in a continuous state of warfare with the savages. Obey God, live according to the teachings of Jesus, and instead of being left to the merciless abuse of enemies we will enjoy the protection of a merciful Father who rules over our enemies as well as over us.

Lines 77 to 86 read: "Catholic philosophy, therefore, concedes to the State the full natural right of war, whether defensive, as in case of another's attack in force upon it; offensive -- more properly, coercive, -- where it finds it necessary to take the initiative in the application of force; or punitive, in the infliction of punishment for evil done against itself or, in some determined cases, against others. International law views the punitive right of war with suspicion; but, though it is open to wide abuse, its original existence under the natural law cannot well be disputed."

Answer: I am not certain just what Father Macksey means by the term "natural law." I have been trying for the past few days to get the use of that volume of the Catholic Encyclopedia dealing with the natural law, in order that I could use the definition of the term that is used by the compilers of the Encyclopedia. Since I am uncertain as to whether I will be favored with the use of the book referred to, I will not wait for it. And, in its absence, I will assume that Father Macksey is using the term "natural law" as meaning the law of nature. God is the author of nature's laws, and the laws for which He is sponsor are in harmony with Christ's teachings. That is, to live according to what Christ taught is to affect the greatest degree of concord with our environment.

Since "Catholic philosophy" is or should be based upon, deduced from, the teaching of Christ, it cannot correctly concede to the State the right of war, for Christ has declared war and the incidents essential to warfare anathema. Yes, He said "there would be wars and rumors of wars," for, in His infinite wisdom, He foresaw that many would reject His Word, while others would ignore His preachments even to the extent of never reading what He had to say about how we should live and how we should die. Christ repudiated the philosophy of defensive warfare when He rebuked Peter for having used the sword, warning: "All that use the sword shall perish with the sword." He disapproved offensive warfare when He told us to treat others as we wish to be treated; and who will say that we want other nations to war upon us? He forbade punitive warfare when He declared that He would attend to the punishment of wrongdoers. St. Paul puts it: "Revenge not yourselves, my dearly beloved: but give place unto wrath, for it is written: Revenge is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord."⁷

You will note that the last sentence in the most recent quotation of Father Macksey's reads: "International law

views the punitive right of war with suspicion; but, though it is open to wide abuse, its original existence under the natural law cannot well be disputed."

Now, anything that "is viewed with suspicion" or "open to wide abuse" is certainly not in harmony with Christianity, for Christian actions are not viewed with suspicion, nor are they open to wide abuse. There is not "wide abuse" or "middle of the road policy" in the Christian doctrine. In Matthew 12:30, Christ lays down the law thusly: "He that is not with Me, is against Me: and he that gathereth not with Me, scattereth." Any action that can be "viewed with suspicion" is quite likely a deviation from the allegiance that Christ demands, and that that is "open to wide abuse" would necessarily be scattering against Christ rather than gathering with Him, for if such were not the fact, its opposite -- which would be the course of a war pursued within what Father Macksey defines as proper limits -- would then be a scattering against Christ.

Lines 87 to 96 read: "The source of the right of war is the natural law, which confers upon states, as upon individuals, the moral powers or rights which are the necessary means to the essential purpose set by the natural law for the individual and the State to accomplish. Just as it is the natural law which, with a view to the natural purposes of mankind's creation, has granted its substantial rights to the state, so it is the same law which concedes the subsidiary right of physical coercion in their maintenance, without which none of its rights would be efficacious."

Answer: If, as I said before, "natural law" means God's laws, then Father Macksey is obviously mistaken when he declares that such laws concede "the subsidiary right of physical coercion in their maintenance, without which none of its rights would be efficacious." I have yet to meet a Christian who will declare that war is a good thing. Everybody that ever went to war believed that war is such a bad thing -- so evil -- that it seemed a worthwhile sacrifice to "use force to the utmost" in order to put a stop to war. Christ tells us in the seventh chapter of Matthew that good trees bring forth good fruit and evil trees bring forth evil fruit. Christ adds: "Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, shall be cut down, and shall be cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits you shall know them." The fruits of war are death, disease, destruction, despair, and damnation. Every war that people ever engaged in was, so the fighters thought, for a good purpose. But the tree was evil and could not bear good fruit. The World War is perhaps the most significant example in all history where the good intentions of the participants had no effect upon the results of the war; the evil tree bore evil fruit.

Lines 96 to 115 read: "The full truth, however, takes into consideration the limitations and extensions of the war-right set by international law in virtue of contract – either

implicit in accepted custom or explicit in formal compact -- among the nations which are party to international legal obligation. But it must be noted that civilized nations, in their effort to ameliorate the cruel conditions of warfare, have sometimes consented to allow, as the less of two imminent evils, that which is forbidden by the natural law. This is not strictly a right, though it is often so denominated, but an international toleration of a natural wrong. In the common territorial or commercial ambitions of great powers there may be an agreement of mutual toleration of what is pure and simple moral wrong by virtue of the natural law, and that without the excuse of it being a less evil than another to be avoided; in this case the unrighteousness is still more evident, for the toleration itself is wrong. The original determination of the right of war comes from the law of nature only; consent of mankind may manifest the existence of a phase of this law; it does not constitute it."

Answer: I need comment very little on what has just been quoted, but I hope that you will take the trouble to re-read the quotation a few times and note how it negates and at the same time affirms Christianity. Father Macksey says: "But it must be noted that civilized nations, in their effort to ameliorate the cruel conditions of warfare, have sometimes consented to allow, as the less of two imminent evils, that which is forbidden by the natural law. This is not strictly a right, though it is often so denominated, but an international toleration of a natural wrong." Now, since civilized nations only "sometimes consent to ... that which is forbidden by the natural law" that consent must be wrong since it "is not strictly a right." Such is the logic of Father Macksey. But Christ says that the toleration of an evil -- "resist not evil" -- is right; therefore, when civilized nations fail to tolerate "the less of two imminent evils" they not only do wrong thereby but also do wrong in failing to tolerate both the imminent evils. Either such is the fact, from the Christian viewpoint, or Christ was misleading us when He said to not resist evil. As explained some pages back, "resist not evil" does not mean that we should do nothing when confronted with evil, but that we should refrain from resisting with physical force; we should, however, resist quite aggressively with the spiritual and intellectual weapons -- emphasis on the spiritual.

The labyrinth of confusion into which Father Macksey has fallen is indicated quite clearly in two passages. He points out that, while the toleration that he speaks of is not strictly a right, it is often so denominated. He does not say whether Catholic theologians so denominate it. He adds, however, that it is an international toleration of a natural wrong. If it is not right to tolerate wrong, then this toleration must be a violation of the natural law, and the fact that the toleration is resorted to in an effort to "ameliorate the cruel conditions of warfare" is no valid excuse, for, if warfare is right, its incident cruelty must be subordinated to the prosecution of that right. When it is a question of right or wrong, there is no time for discussing the question of suffering. For, in the long run, that that is right results in the minimum amount of pain, while that that is

wrong produces the maximum amount of torment.

Then, Father Macksey points out that in territorial or commercial ambitions of great powers, they may mutually agree to tolerate what is wrong, despite the fact that the wrong is not a lesser evil than the one to be avoided, and concludes that in this case the unrighteousness is still more evident, for the toleration itself is wrong. Now, if the toleration is wrong in the last instance, it must be wrong in the first instance, although in the first case the nations are avoiding war as the lesser of the two evils while in the second instance they are avoiding war because it is commercially wise to do so. But, in either case, the wrong that they are closing one eye to is merely a question of degree. Quite cunningly, Father Macksey refers to the first case as being "not strictly a right." Why does he use equivocal terms? Why not say "it is wrong" or "it is right." It must be one or the other. The line of demarcation between right and wrong is always clear.

Lines 116 to 144 deal with the question of nations entrusting the exercise of their power to an international arbiter, concluding that they are "not bound so to do, nor has it been done in the past save in exceptional cases." We need not spend any time on this part of Father Macksey's argument, for the discussion now engaged in is whether war is right or wrong from the Christian viewpoint.

Lines 145 to 180 deal with the subject of "The Possessor of the Right of War," pointing out that such right must be in the hands of the State. If I were to agree that war is justifiable, even within the limits designated by Father Macksey, I would agree with his contention that "any such right in hands other than those of the sovereign power would upset the peace and order of the whole state." But, since I declare war to be entirely wrong, the question of who has the right to be the custodian or guardian of this Satanic institution need not be entered into. However, the last six lines of the section of Father Macksey's argument just referred to are worthy of some observation. He says: "With the supreme power lies also the judicial authority to determine when war is necessary, and what is the necessary and proportionate measure of damage it may therein inflict: there is no other natural tribunal to which recourse may be had, and without this judicial faculty the right of war would be vain."

Man is anterior to the State. Since God has forbidden him to kill, the State cannot confer the right to kill, and therefore the power to order its citizens to slaughter their fellow men is not vested with the State. God alone can issue such an order. Either Christ is a liar or war is never necessary, and, very properly assuming that Christ told the truth, it follows that the State is without "judicial authority to determine when

war is necessary" because it is never necessary.

On page 572, volume eight, Catholic Encyclopedia, under the caption of Justice⁸, we read: "The power of the State is limited by the end for which it was instituted, and it has no authority to violate the natural rights of its subjects." Now, one of the natural rights of a subject, is to serve God according to the dictates of his conscience. You will remember my quoting Father Fisher, S.J., who wrote an article on the Supremacy of Conscience in which he said: "When conscience decrees that the ordinances of God and the State conflict, God, not the State, must be obeyed." My conscience has decreed -- and quite consistently so, as I will yet prove -- that it is wrong to kill even for one's country. Yet, to continue the quotation on Justice which appears in the Catholic Encyclopedia: "For the common good it (the State) has authority to compel individual citizens to risk life for the defence of their country when it is in peril, and to part with a portion of their property when this is required for a public road, etc." The State whose citizens obey God, the country whose citizens obey God, will never be "in peril." To use weapons other than those that our divine Lord has commanded we should use is to bring one's country into a state of peril. In Psalms we are told: "Unless the Lord keep the city, he watch in vain that keepeth it."⁹ You will observe that Father Fisher claims it is one's duty to ignore the State if his conscience decrees that the State orders him to do what is wrong -- and Father Fisher was writing on the question of war -- yet the writer in the Catholic Encyclopedia has made no proviso for following the dictates of conscience. In other words he has left God out of the consideration altogether.

Yet, on page 573, while still pursuing his treatise on Justice, the writer of the article, says: "A man himself even has no right to dispose of his own life and limbs; God alone is the Lord of life and death." If I have no right to dispose of my own life, from where do I derive the right to dispose of another man's life? And, as I stated before, man existed prior to the State, and his evolving into a social animal did not alter his relations with his Maker and did not give him the right to commit in the name of a group of individuals that that God has unconditionally forbidden him to commit at any time. "Thou shalt not kill."

Suppose a crazy man becomes the head of a government. Suppose he influences his subordinates to determine that war is necessary. It was claimed that Kaiser Wilhelm was just such a person. Well, according to Father Macksey, and according to the writer on Justice in the Catholic Encyclopedia, it becomes the duty of the aforementioned lunatic's subjects to spring to arms and sally forth on an expedition of collective homicide. For my part I rejoice that I have some other guide besides imbeciles and profiteers. Father Macksey concludes the paragraph that I last quoted thusly: "There is no other natural tribunal to which recourse may be had, and without this judicial faculty the right of war would be vain." What is wrong with having recourse to the supernatural tribunal? In what does the privilege of being a

Christian consist if not in appealing to God almighty in times of stress? If He cannot save us, why believe in Him? If He ordered us to not kill, then sent His only Son upon earth to repeat that command on numerous occasions and to teach us a doctrine that in its very essence is repugnant to all forms of physical violence, killing, etc., and then when we are confronted with serious difficulties, if that doctrine of Christ's failed do you think that God would be giving us a square deal? Are you ready to assert that He played a crooked game? Take in my own church for instance; they feel that they have a perfect right to take part in war regardless of what God has said. But, according to Emerson God plays with loaded dice, it is useless to try to beat Him.

I will quote one more passage from the Catholic Encyclopedia's treatise on Justice: "Because man is a person, a free and intelligent being, created in the image of God, he has a dignity and worth vastly superior to the material and animal world by which he is surrounded. Man can know, love and worship his Creator; he was made for that end, which he can only attain perfectly in the future, immortal, and neverending life to which he is destined. God gave him his faculties and his liberty in order that he might freely work for the accomplishment of his destiny. He is in duty bound to strive to fulfill the designs of his Creator, he must exercise his faculties and conduct his life according to the intentions of his Lord and Master. Because he is under these obligations he is consequently invested with rights, God-given and primordial, antecedent to the State and independent of it. Such are man's natural rights, granted to him by nature herself, sacred, as is their origin, and inviolable."

I agree with all that I have just quoted. Which is another way of saying that, according to the logic I am endeavoring to present, there is disagreement between Father Macksey and the priest who wrote what I have just quoted. I blundered in not writing down the name of the priest who wrote the article on Justice, but I expect to be out of the insane asylum some day -- you know, when I get sane again -- and I am going to peep into the Catholic Encyclopedia, write down that name, and refer His Reverence to Father Macksey. They ought to settle that difference between them and let us know which one of them is right before we are asked to believe either one of them. I have an idea though, that, the one who wrote the article on Justice is the one whose opinion will govern the minds of people in time to come; that is, the part that I have just quoted will govern. I should not complain about Father Macksey though, for what I previously quoted from the statement on Justice is denied by that that I quoted last. Let us analyze the last quotation before proceeding with Father Macksey's argument.

If man was made for the end of knowing, loving and worshiping his Creator, why is it necessary to slay his fellow men in order to know, love and worship God? You will say that he has to

defend himself when attacked, that "self-preservation is the first law of nature." These arguments have been answered previously; we must defend ourselves with the spiritual and intellectual weapons; the highest degree of self-preservation is to live in unity with God and obey His commandments.

Since "man was made for the end of knowing, loving and worshiping his Creator," it is evident that he is not living according to the end for which he was created when he makes war upon us, and, since it is our duty to enlighten those in darkness, we should show him the error of his ways instead of riddling his body with bullets. You will contend that while trying to show him the error of his ways he will slay you. Are you unwilling to die for Christ? You are not sure, however, that you would be slain, for God is able to restrain your adversary in more ways than one. God is able to check the advance of an army by methods more effective than cannon. You must confess that it is simply a question of faith. God can take care of you, but you are afraid to give Him a chance, you lack faith.

You will ask: "What would you do if your home was attacked by the Germans, your wife outraged and your baby killed?" My answer is that, if I retained the faith that I have thus far had in God, I would do my utmost to overcome evil with good, and, if I failed to save my wife and baby and our home, I would feel that I did more for my loved ones by remaining loyal to God than if I had violated God's laws. I have an abiding faith, however, that, by returning good for evil I would save my baby's life, my wife's honor, and insure the safety of our home. Moreover, I would do more to save the lives and property of my fellow men than an army well supplied with instruments of destruction, for the simple reason that I would be on the side of God, and God is mightier than all the armies in the world combined.

"He (man) is in duty bound to strive to fulfill the designs of his Creator, he must exercise his faculties and conduct his life according to the intentions of his Lord and Master," says the author of the article on Justice. Agreed! The intentions of our Lord and Master are clearly outlined in the New Testament, and there is not a single utterance of the Messiah that will justify participation in war, while there are more than a hundred of His preachments that positively condemn the thoughts and actions of which war is composed. Because of his obligations to God, the writer on Justice claims that man is invested with rights antecedent to the State and independent of it. One of these rights is to refuse military service; it not only is a right but a duty. Father Macksey is wrong in declaring that the State has the supreme power to declare war and the judicial authority to determine when war is necessary, for, in the first instance, God has not delegated to the State the supreme power to call upon His creatures to do that that is wrong; and, in the second place, since war is never necessary, it is impossible that the State should possess judicial authority to declare it to be so.

Man's country is the world. Imaginary boundary lines cannot make enemies out of those whose interests are identical. Profiteers do not pay any attention to boundary lines; why should the masses? God loves what we call foreigners just as much as He loves us.

I remember a conversation I had with a friend of mine, a young lady who was employed in a government office. She was naturally patriotic and her business surroundings had anything but a dampening effect upon her patriotism. This conversation took place a little more than three years ago, shortly after I had written to President Wilson telling him that, although I registered, I would accept prison or death or both in preference to military service. "I read your letter to the president, Ben Salmon, and I want to tell you that if I were a man I would be ashamed not to fight for my country. A man who will not fight for the country that does so much for him ought not to have the privileges that he enjoys," is the manner in which I was greeted as I stepped off the car one evening. I explained to my charming friend that I was fighting for my country, that my country was the world, that all men are my brothers. I called her attention, incidentally, to the fact that the particular part of my country known as the United States of America had never done anything for me except to prevent me from getting the product of my toil, that the laws passed were for the purpose of making the rich still richer and the poor still poorer. But, it was like explaining the science of political economy to a canary bird, for my good friend was viewing everything in life through the colored lens of patriotism. Patriotism is a good thing, like many other good things, when we use it properly. It is quite natural to love one's home country, just as we have a particular fondness for the city in which we live and a burning love for "home sweet home." But we can love our home, our city, our state, our nation, without hating those who reside elsewhere. Should we unfortunately fall into the error of hating people of a different nationality, or should they fall into the error of hating us, we must ask God to supply us with a super abundance of love, for hate will not overcome hate. The only weapon that will conquer hate is love.

Henry George beautifully expressed the idea of helping rather than injuring others in these words: "What is there of which life gives us opportunity that can be compared with the effort to do what we may, be it ever so little, to improve social conditions and enable other lives to reach fuller, nobler development?" Social conditions -- and we are now considering them in their international aspect -- can be improved only constructively, and through the means established by God. We can never profit at the expense of others. If we wish to defend ourselves, if we wish to improve our condition in life, there is only one way in which it can be done, viz: help others. If others either through ignorance or through cowardly submission to conscription laws, begin to invade the country in which we live, we must defend them against their ignorance and their cowardice by showing them

the Christian way of living. We must show them by example and by word. If you are afraid that you will lose your life in the effort to thus teach Christianity, then you are unworthy. It is impossible to preach Christianity with bullets.

Let us suppose, for example, that in the recent war the Belgians overcame -- rather tried to overcome -- evil with good, but that the Germans marched on heedless of good example. It is doubting God to suppose such a condition, because He assured us that good would overcome evil. However, I want to carry this illustration to its ultimate. The Germans are now invading France, and France "turns the other cheek." The Germans then bring England under their domination because England returned only kindness in exchange for brutality. The Germans finally gain control of Europe, because everywhere they went they met only Christian submission, they were treated only with good will.Flushed with victory, the Germans proceed to annex the American continent and they are treated only with love wherever they go. After but a brief period of aggression, Germany rules the world. Would the doctrine of "overcome evil with good" have failed? Not at all. Understand, I do not grant that the Kaiser would have gone the road that I have indicated, or that his subjects would support him in any such policy, but for purposes of illustration I am assuming that God hardened the hearts of the Germans and darkened their intellect so that they would not respond to Christian treatment. Not only has the Kaiser and his subjects made the world a German empire, but they have tyrannized the peoples of the earth, degraded the women, killed the children, enslaved the men, confiscated all the property, and set up the cruelest autocracy that the world has ever known. Would our Christian spirit have failed? Not at all. There are many things to consider. First, we would have obeyed God; secondly, we would have overcome ourselves, which as Napoleon said is a greater feat than overcoming the world; and, thirdly, we would have set an example of Christian living that would endure forever. You might say that you would rather be dead than live under such conditions. Well, in the first place you must admit that God would not permit evil to overpower good in the manner that I have related. And, secondly, even though He did permit it, you would have more to gain living under such conditions and being loyal to God than living in any manner that it is possible for you to conceive while at the same time not thinking and acting according to Christ's teachings. This life is short, we must leave here soon, but the life for which the present is only a preparation will continue for eternity. If you are willing to take a chance with your life on the battlefield in order to, as you erroneously suppose, enjoy a few years of liberty at home, it seems that you should be willing to risk your life on Christ's battlefield in order that you may enjoy an eternity of liberty in your eternal home.

"What would you have done," asked a very dear friend of mine "if you were in President Wilson's place on the date that he signed the declaration of war against Germany?" My reply was in the

form of another question, thusly: "What would Christ have done?" We know from the life of Christ just what His attitude would have been, and, as Christians, it is our duty to copy after Him. It would require great courage to act Christianly, if one were in President Wilson's place at the time mentioned, but God can and will supply all the courage necessary.

I know a man who often wrote articles on moral courage. But, when the war broke out, judging from many of his actions, he forgot all about moral courage. He pleaded that it was a time for discretion, when one had to be sensible, that there was no use in bumping your head against a stone wall. On the contrary, it was a time for courage, for moral courage, a time when, no matter what the cost, a Christian should be a Christian. And, so it is today. We should have sufficient moral courage to advocate America's disarmament -- complete disarmament -- no matter what happens to us. And, if we turn out to be heavy losers in the agitation, so far as we personally are concerned, God will balance up the account in some manner. And, if He fails to balance the account, what of it? Often, we stake all and lose in worldly ventures; surely we can stake all, even if we do lose, for God's sake. But, there is no danger of losing, we could not lose if we actually wanted to lose.

Lines 181 to 188 of Father Macksey's argument read: "The primary title of a state to go to war is: first, the fact that the state's rights -- either directly or indirectly through those of its citizens -- are menaced by foreign aggression not otherwise to be prevented than by war; secondly, the fact of actual violation of right not otherwise reparable; thirdly, the need of punishing the threatening or infringing power for the security of the future."

Answer: The statement "not otherwise to be prevented than by war" is the key to the whole situation. The weapons of the Almighty are more powerful to prevent foreign aggression than bullets. Father Macksey gives as the secondary title: "violation of right not otherwise reparable." If we leave reparation to the wisdom of God, He will not fail to compensate us for injury done to us. But, if we take the matter out of God's hands and proceed to extend Satan's domain by enlisting with his forces and using the instruments that displease God, then we cannot expect God to repay us in any way for the manner in which our rights have been violated. Fact is, we can only look for greater misfortunes in varied forms, such as disease and pestilence and famine that usually follow in the wake of wars.

Violation of right is reparable otherwise than by war, and simple remedy is offered to suffering mankind in the 11th chapter of Mark: "Therefore I say unto you, all things, whatsoever you ask when you pray, believe that you shall receive; and they shall come unto you. And when you shall stand to pray, forgive, if you have aught against any man; that your Father also, who is in heaven, may forgive you your sins. But if you will not forgive, neither will your Father that is in heaven, forgive you your sins."

Thus we are told that, if others have wronged us, we must forgive. So, it is not necessary to go to war in order to have our wrongs righted. All that we need to do is to forgive, and God will take care of the rest. We are told that as a reward for our having forgiven others, God will forgive us. He has many ways in which to manifest His forgiveness. If you are a farmer, He can bless you with good crops; if you are an artisan He can direct your steps in the path of profitable and continued employment; and if you are a businessman He can breathe success into your ventures. He can bless all of us with good health, preservation from accidents. As a nation He can preserve us in peace and prosperity. These things and millions of others He can do and He will do for us, if we will have faith in Him and forgive those who have wronged us. "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us."¹⁰

And how much need we have of forgiveness! Take my own case: I do not mind letting you know a secret; that secret is: I have, all my life, been a pretty decent sort of a fellow. My mother will bear me out in this. As a boy, I was a good boy. Since maturity, I have been a good man. In fact, like every other person, like all other persons, I have been above the average in goodness. Yet, if I were to get what is coming to me I would be in a sorry fix. If God were to deal with me as justice demands I should be dealt with, there are not many who would be willing to trade places with me. My dependence is upon the mercy of God. I gladly forgive others, for I am sorely in need of forgiveness. This is what you call being practical; a rather pragmatic attitude. God has made it plain that if I do not forgive others I will not be forgiven, and if He does not forgive me for the sins of my past life my future life both in this world and in the next would indeed be dark and dreary. What is true of the individual is true of that group of individuals known as the nation. If, as a nation, we want God's forgiveness and the blessings that will follow in consequence of our rehabilitation, then we must forgive other nations. God will not believe that we have forgiven other nations if we wage war against them while reciting that part of the Lord's prayer which reads "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us."

Father Macksey outlines as the third and final title of a state to go to war: "The need of punishing the threatening or infringing power for the security of the future." History is a continuous repetition of wars being fought for that purpose, but after thousands of years of effort and the sacrifice of billions of lives, the objective remains unaccomplished. Inflicting punishment upon others does not make our present nor our future any more secure; fact is, we by that process threaten and undermine our security, for the Law of Compensation¹¹ debits our account and the payment of the debt weakens us at a time when we need all our resources to barely hold our own. Germany punished France for the security of the future. Look at Germany today! Since we desire the maximum amount of security, the way to get it is to go out of our way in efforts to befriend our foes.

Just a few days ago we were given another example of a country at war because, as Father Macksey put it, they felt "the need of punishing the threatening or infringing power for the security of the future." The Washington Post of August 12, 1920, informs us that the Polish Minister, who was seeking the extension of America's credit to Poland and the privilege of purchasing our surplus war stocks, declared that Poland, and her government have long understood the psychology of Bolshevism, and, in order to protect others was forced to undertake, for defensive purposes, an offensive war. Same old stuff! Diplomats have uttered the essence of that declaration in varied forms for centuries, and, somehow, the dear people always fall for it.

Poland is, I believe, a Catholic nation. Since she felt the need of guaranteeing her own and others' future security, it would have been well to refer to Matthew 7:24: "Every one therefore that heareth these my words, and doth them, shall be likened to a wise man that builds his house upon a rock. And the rain fell, and the floods came, and winds blew, and they beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded on a rock. "And every one that heareth these my words, and doth them not, shall be like a foolish man that built his house upon the sand. And the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and they beat upon that house, and it fell, and great was the fall thereof."

Had Poland built her future security upon the rock of God's holy word, which would have necessitated disuse of the mailed fist and the substitution of love, many are her citizens who would today be alive and well and prosperous. As it is, the nation has purchased for itself retribution which in some form or other must sooner or later be visited upon her else Christ's declaration in Matthew 7:2 would be untrue.

The rain of bursting shells, floods of conquest, and of hate, the winds of war in all its modern terror, could have beat upon Poland's house, but it would have fallen not had it been built upon the rock of God's truth. Christ, made it plain that lip worship will not suffice. It not enough that we should believe what He teaches and preach what He taught, but also we must do. "Everyone that heareth these words and doth them, etc." The fact that Bolsheviks are principally, if not all, materialists, does not interfere with the working of God's laws. Unbelievers as well as believers are subject to the mystical influence of the Almighty, for "God works in mysterious ways His wonders to perform."

So often it is claimed that "saints have gone to war." That does not make war right. The apostles were saints, but they did not go to war. St. Paul was one of the greatest saints, and he led the life of a warrior bold until his conversion to Christianity, then we find him preaching a doctrine that is entirely out of harmony with our twentieth-century muscular Christianity. Twenty-nine years after our Lord's Ascension, while St. Paul was a prisoner

in Rome, he wrote his memorable Epistle to The Ephesians, in the sixth chapter of which we read: "Finally, brethren, be strengthened in the Lord, and in the might of His power. Put you on the armour of God, that you may be able to stand against the deceits of the devil. For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood; but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirits of wickedness in the high places. Therefore take unto you the armour of God, that you may be able to resist in the evil day, and to stand in all things perfect. Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of justice, And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace: In all things taking the shield of faith, wherewith you may be able to extinguish all the fiery darts of the most wicked one. And take unto you the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit (which is the Word of God)." Study these words of St. Paul for a few minutes, read them over two or three times, and I believe you will become convinced that, if we are going to use a sword upon enemies, we should use "the sword of the Spirit."

I was discussing Father Macksey's defense of war as a means of preserving "the security of the future." You have heard St. Paul's testimony, and now, that you may make a little comparison by way of contrast, I will recite Norman Angell's quotation of Admiral Fisher of the British Navy: "The Supremacy of the British Navy is the best security for the peace of the world. ... If you rub it in, both at home and abroad, that you are ready for instant war, with every unit of your strength in the first line and waiting to be first in, and hit your enemy in the belly and kick him when he is down, and boil your prisoners in oil (if you take any), and torture his women and children, then people will keep clear from you."¹² Aside from its unchristian attitude, such threats of frightfulness do not frighten anybody, for your adversaries feel confident that they can be just as terrible or a little more terrible than you. Germany's superior fighting machine, built with the patient effort of forty years, did not scare her enemies; on the contrary, Germany's military power goaded them on to destroy her. Whose philosophy is best -- Admiral Fisher's or Saint Paul's?

Lines 189 to 212 cover the matter of rescuing the innocent from oppression. I will quote the salient features: "Secondary titles may come to a state ... from the fact of the oppression of the innocent, whose unjust suffering is proportionate to the gravity of war and whom it is impossible to rescue in any other way; in this latter case the innocent have the right to resist, charity calls for assistance, and the intervening state may justly assume the communication of the right of the innocent to exercise extreme coercion in their behalf. ... It has been argued that the extension of a state's punitive right outside of the field of its own subjects would seem to be a necessity of natural conditions; for the right must be somewhere, if we are to have law and order on the earth, and there is no place to put it except in the hands of the

state that is willing to undertake the punishment. Still the matter is not as clear as the right to interfere in defence of the innocent."

Answer: Father Macksey refers to the oppression of the innocent whom it is impossible to rescue in any other way than by war. There is no such condition on God's earth! There is always another way to thwart oppression of the innocent; resort to war is criminal folly; either this is true or Christianity is a dream. By resorting to war to save the innocent from oppression, you thereby bring oppression and suffering to many times more innocent people than those you set out to help. Belgium had a population of less than 8,000,000. The cry went forth to save her from Germany. The war is over now, and the Red Cross reports 12,000,000 orphans as the result of it. These orphans are innocent, still they have been and are still being oppressed despite the Allies' victory over Germany. Ten million lost their lives in the war, other millions were wounded and crippled, and thousands upon thousands will grope around in blindness for the remainder of their lives. The influenza polled a greater death toll than the war. Most of the victims that I have referred to were innocent, they were virtually dragged into the maelstrom of war and its sequential misery against their wishes.

The way to protect the innocent is to remind them of what Christ said in Matthew 11:28: "Come to Me, all you that labor, and are burdened, and I will refresh you. Take up my yoke upon you, and learn of Me, because I am meek, and humble of heart: and you shall find rest to your souls. For My yoke is sweet and My burden light."

The innocent who are burdened with oppression cannot find relief in man. Only One has the power to succor them, and that One does not require the aid of machine guns or poison gas. That One may not succor the innocent just in the manner that you and I think He should do it, but succor them he will, and He will do so quicker and more effectively than any army of men, and He will do it without subjecting other innocent people to oppression. Who pays the debt of war? The innocent who had nothing to do with the war! Countless millions of children will be underfed and underclothed and undereducated in the years to come in order that the debt of the recent hysteria may be paid to the international bankers. And the children of the bankers will not be numbered among those that are underfed, underclothed, and undereducated.

"Learn of Me, because I am meek, and humble of heart." That does not sound like a war doctrine to me. Webster's dictionary defines meek thusly: "Mild of temper; patient under injuries; not vain, haughty, or resentful; forbearing; mild; unassuming; gentle." It is evident that meekness is everything that war is not. In defining humility, Webster's states: "humility

is being humble; freedom from pride; act of submission or courtesy." It says of humble: "near the ground; unpretending; thinking lowly of one's self; not proud or assuming; to abase; to mortify." Of course Christ meant a great deal more than we learn by these few words from Webster's, when He bade us to be meek and humble of heart, but Webster's or any other good dictionary will provide sufficient information to cause us to think along the line of thought that Jesus had in mind when He addressed us as just quoted. Our divine Lord assures us that if we do as He has asked us to do we "shall find rest to our souls." Webster's tells us that "rest" is a state of quiet or repose; peace; security; ease; tranquility; quiet; repose without anxiety." And, to allay any fears that might suggest themselves; to inspire us with confidence in the acceptance of His doctrine; Christ uttered that promising asseveration; "For My yoke is sweet and My burden light." In other words He told us that the road that He asks us to travel will redound to our greatest comfort.

The anger and pride and hatred and bitterness fostered by the newspapers and their profiteering owners in the prosecution of a war make it impossible, aside from the wrong of wholesale killing, to carry on a war in the spirit of meekness and humility that Christ demands of those who would earn life everlasting. Nor is the rancor confined to the field of battle. Consider the persecutions at home. Our jails are still filled with those whose only crime was an anti-war expression. An incident in Denver will illustrate. We had a local branch of the People's Council for Democracy and Peace, of which the writer was secretary. A certain switchman, who had been an esteemed friend of mine for several years, wrote to one of the newspapers offering to contribute ten dollars towards the purchase of a rope with which to hang members of the People's Council. He evidently wanted to make a good job of the hanging, for, as I have related, he agreed to donate ten dollars toward the purchase of a rope. His signed agreement was photographed and published in one of the daily papers. This man is a good man, one of Denver's best citizens, but the war worked him up to a high tension, just as it did with so many persons of an otherwise commendable character.

An officer in the Department of Justice was one day trying to impress me with how badly disliked I was in the city of Denver. This officer was a friend of mine. He said: "I'll bet you a hundred dollars that I can stuff a dummy, tie a rope on the end of it, start running down the street yelling 'This is Ben Salmon' and within less than five minutes there will be 5,000 people hanging onto that rope and ready to hang you. They will not know why they are doing it, but that is how worked-up they are over this situation." Why was I disliked? Because I opposed war. A terrible offense!

It was sometime in March, 1918, I believe, that Miss Kennan and Miss Nafe were dismissed from the faculty of the Denver high school because they refused to sign a pledge which, in essence, required them to instill so-called patriotism into the hearts and

minds of their pupils. I attended the meeting of the School Board. Miss Kennan and Miss Nafe explained their reasons for refusing to sign the pledge, and those reasons teemed with real Americanism. The Principal of the school made a plea on behalf of the school children, eulogized Miss Kennan's seventeen years of service and Miss Nafe's seven years of service, and implored the School board to retain these teachers who had served and were still serving and from all appearances would continue to serve the community so well. But the war spirit was abroad in the land. although they are not Christians, Miss Kennan and Miss Nafe bore the injustice of their dismissal in a most Christianly manner. Denver was removed about 4,000 miles from the scene of the murderous conflict between the contending forces. When hate has such a grip on the hearts and minds of people that far distant from the firing line, it must be intense in the theater of hostilities. A soldier who participated in the four biggest battles of the war and came out lucky told me: "You don't think about getting killed, all you think of is hatred and fighting." And the muscles of his face twitched as he told of his hatred of the Germans. If fate had rolled the dice a little differently, he would have been hating and fighting the French. There was no foundation to his hate except what he had read in the newspapers.

Father Macksey tells us that when the innocent are oppressed "charity calls for assistance," and he argues that they are entitled to the assistance that we can render them in the process of war. If "charity" calls for assistance, how can we respond to the call of charity with weapons that are uncharitable? Webster's dictionary defines charity thusly: "Love; good will; generosity; act of kindness; gift to support one; benevolence; tenderness; beneficence." The only one of these definitions that could possibly harmonize with war is "generosity." That is, in war we love our neighbor by filling his body with a generous supply of bullets.

Since charity calls for assistance, let us resolve to render only such assistance as will come within the scope of charity. In that way we will render Christian assistance, which is the only kind of assistance that will assist those suffering from oppression. In striving to restrain the oppressors of the innocent, we must use, not weapons of destruction, but weapons of kindness, tenderness, good will, and love. Then we will help not only the oppressed but also the oppressors and ourselves. War harms all three.

In 1-Corinthians, chapter 13, St. Paul tells us what charity is and the value that we should place upon it. He says: "If I speak with the tongues of men, and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And if I should have prophecy and should know all mysteries, and all knowledge, and if I should have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. And if I should

distribute all my goods to feed the poor, and if I should deliver my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing. Charity is patient, is kind: charity envieth not, dealeth not perversely; is not puffed up; is not ambitious, seeketh not her own, is not provoked to anger, thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth with the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things ... And now there remain faith, hope, and charity, these three: but the greatest of these is charity."

How do England's army and navy protect innocent Ireland from oppression? Certainly not with charity. And, if the whole world would interfere militarily in Ireland's behalf, we would injure rather than help Ireland. Ireland is suffering, but man cannot aid her except in so far as he used God's weapons of patience, kindness, tolerance, meekness, and truth. A friend of mine said: "Ireland has been relying upon God for seven-hundred years, and finally she has decided to fight her way to liberty." It is not true that Ireland has relied upon God for 700 years, for all through her history she has resorted to Satan's instruments. Not continuously, but she has resorted to killing nevertheless. I am not attempting to berate Ireland, for I have Irish blood in my veins and my sympathies are with Ireland. And, because of my sympathy for Ireland, I declare that if she were to discard all her weapons of physical violence, put her faith in God, use only prayer and love and good will, and return the evil of England with the good that is Ireland's, she would triumph. Ireland went to battle with the Englishmen against Germany, thinking that she would get her freedom for loyalty to the Mother country. But freedom cannot be purchased that way.

Recently I received a pamphlet published by the Friends Of Irish Freedom, 280 Broadway, New York, which contains a masterly article entitled The Freedom of the Seas, written by Hon. Daniel F. Cohalan, Justice of the Supreme Court of New York. He presents a gloomy picture, almost every page spells war between England and America. He tells us that the struggle between America and the British Empire is inevitable; already begun; that the two countries are driven to seek the same markets; that the contest in its peaceful stage could be prolonged, but not avoided, if business enough for both countries were possible, but that such a condition exists only in the dreams of the philosophers and not in the hard matter of fact concrete conditions of every day life. The sad part of Judge Cohalan's article is that it stresses the need of England's downfall in order that America and Ireland might live.

Judge Cohalan asks: "Why did these able diplomats of England insist that the question of the freedom of the seas should not be even discussed at the Paris Conference unless they realized its vital importance to England? Of what use is the fleet unless it be for the purpose of making America bend the knee as all other commercial competitors have been compelled to bend it?" From a military viewpoint, his argument is unanswerable.

He has presented his statement skillfully, and he has proved that, considered militarily, "a grave crisis confronts the statesmen of our country." But, even though we should succeed in destroying England's naval supremacy -- which would cause England's disintegration as a world power -- unless we destroy that supremacy with means other than physical force, we will have succeeded only in shifting the base of navalism from one section to another. The World War did not crush militarism except in Germany; then super-militarism assumed control of the situation and moved its headquarters from Berlin to London. The people of the world were not benefited. If America and Ireland or either of them were to succeed in banishing everything English from the face of the earth, nothing good would be accomplished unless Christianity -- not the muscular type -- were advanced. And Christianity does not thrive upon the ruin of any nation or any individual. I am sure that not anybody wants everything English blotted out, but those of Judge Cohalan's type want England bound hand and foot so that she cannot do any more damage. They are justified in seeking relief from England's iniquity, for I believe that of all the black pages in history, the one that England wrote is the blackest. Still, the way to free the oppressed people who now writhe in agony and despair 'neath England's iron heel,' is not to engage in a punitive war as suggested by Father Macksey, but to Christianly show England how unchristian are her ways. The best manner in which to show her this is by example rather than word. America, disarm! Teach the world what a blessed doctrine Christianity really is. You will have plenty of markets for your produce, God will attend to every little detail, and all that He asks of you is loyalty.

England is not the only oppressor of the innocent. There is another country with which we are quite familiar, who uses her naval and her military power to still further oppress the oppressed. I speak of none other than good old U.S.A.

In most quarters, little is known of the sad plight of Santo Domingo. America's subsidized press is careful to mention Uncle Sam's dictatorship in only laudable phrases. We learn from the Nation of July 17, 1920, that Tulio M. Cestero, Ex-Minister Plenipotentiary of the Dominican Republic and former Ambassador of Santo Domingo at Paris, Rome, and Madrid, addressed a certain appeal to the Congress of the United States in which he depicts conditions of an appalling nature in Santo Domingo. In 1916, "the Dominican Republic was occupied by the United States Army, and by the authority of the Government at Washington, the constitutional president of the Republic ...was deposed and the Congress of the nation suspended. ... Without consulting the Dominican people and without granting them legitimate representation, existing laws are amended, new laws promulgated, new taxes levied." Censorship and "justice" is administered by officers of the army of occupation as a means of prevention and of punishment. "The methods and procedure of the military government against which the Dominican people protest in so far as they are

permitted to do so by the little liberty which the censorship and the Provost Courts leave them, have been defined in a letter which on December 29, 1919, Mons. A. A. Nouel, Archbishop of Santo Domingo and Metropolitan of America, wrote to the Hon. W. W. Russell, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States who had asked for "his impressions concerning the general state of the country. ""

Among some of the more brutal incidents of censorship, domination and oppression related in Mons. Nouel's letter are: "the water torture; cremation of women and children, burned to death in houses set on fire; torture by torsion or the use of tourniquets; men hunted through the country like wild animals; an old man, a septuagenarian, dragged at the tail of a horse in the full light of midday in the public square of the village of Hato Mayor; a Spanish priest of exemplary conduct, imprisoned in a filthy dungeon for six months because he expressed an opinion about the German army long before America entered the war."

The Military Government published the following authentic statement: "There was a time in which the Military Government repelled violence by violence and there were even secondary authorities who distinguished themselves by their cruelty, surpassing themselves in their measures of prevention and repression." Not an accusation of Dominicans, but a confession of the military regime.

Jose Cepeda was suspected of hiding arms. His two daughters were forced to appear nude before the troops and in order to make Cepeda confess, he was tortured and the soles of his feet burned, so that he could no longer walk.

Again quoting: "Two countrymen who were witnesses in an extortion suit were testifying before the Court of Appeals of Santiago de los Caballeros. One of them suddenly opened his shirt and showed the judge the burns left by the torture to which he had been subjected by officers of the army of occupation. The President of the Court, Dr. Juan Perez, rose and striking the table so hard that the force caused the figure of the Christ, that presides at all the courts of the country, to fall and break, exclaimed: 'This is horrible. It is a farce. I am going. I cannot condemn these poor people while the crimes of these officers remain unpunished.' "

Rear Admiral Thomas Snowden, America's military governor in Santo Domingo -- not by choice of the people but by an edict of an American autocrat -- replying, in conversation, to a request of prominent Dominicans that some steps be taken toward the restoration of self-government in Santo Domingo, said: "That Santo Domingo would continue to be a republic and would have a congress, but that he, the Admiral, would be the Congress."

It's a long story, a tale of cruelty and usurpation

that should make every American blush for shame. Yet, I am sure that President Wilson can justify his action in the light of Father Macksey's article on war. Once admit that a fundamental wrong is a necessary right and you can go the limit, for, in trying to sustain the soundness of that that is unsound, one is compelled to make concessions that in turn are made the bases for extended wrongs.

America is, of course, domineering Santo Domingo in the interests of the Dominicans, just as England is subjugating Ireland for the benefit of Irishmen. Navalism and militarism enable both oppressors to continue their work of benevolence.

A couple of days ago I read an article in the Washington Post, stating that "The military government established in Santo Domingo by the United States has started the island republic on the road to prosperity and successful self-government, according to a report of the governor, Rear Admiral Thomas Snowden, made public recently by the Navy Department." The report goes on to relate in glowing terms the beneficent work done by the military government. American censorship in Santo Domingo will see to it that Admiral Snowden's report is not denied. The American newspapers -- the kept press of the profiteers -- will feed the public mind of our liberty-loving citizens with the made-to-order pabulum of the militarists, and all will be well with the military regime just south of us. I have a little personal experience with the reports of military authorities. While conscientious objectors and soldier prisoners were being starved, beaten, manacled, and persecuted in numerous other ways, the newspapers told of the ideal conditions existing in Uncle Sam's model military prisons.

America was struck dumb at the reports of the brutal manner in which Germany treated the Belgians, and America went to war largely on behalf of Belgium. For almost a year before her entry into the World War, she had been secretly terrorizing the Dominicans, and is still doing so. It was profitable for American munitions manufacturers that America should with one hand oppress the Dominicans and with the other hand aid the oppressed Belgians. In both cases the profiteer coined easy money and American churchmen asked God's blessing upon our fighting forces. Abraham Lincoln once said that no man is good enough to govern another, and if he tries to govern another he will make a fool of himself and a slave of the other. The view of the profiteer though is that he is not responsible for Lincoln's mistakes. If God created us free and equal -- that is with equal rights -- why do the authorized spokesmen of Christianity favor maintaining an institution that makes slaves of all except a privileged few? It is my humble opinion that since God is a just judge, He will some day put a question similar to that before His ministers when they appear in His presence for judgment.

We have now reached that part of the section last quoted from Father Macksey which reads: "It has been argued that the extension of a state's punitive right outside of the field of its own subjects would seem to be a necessity of natural conditions; for the right must be somewhere, if we are to have law and order on the earth, and there is no place to put it except in the hands of the state that is willing to undertake the punishment. Still, the matter is not as clear as the right to interfere in defense of the innocent."

Answer: Depends on what kind of "law and order" you want. We have the most perfect kind of order in the graveyard, the people who inhabit such sections do not bother anybody, and they just slumber on peacefully. I'll admit that the Allies established law and order in Europe, and so has the United States established law and order in Santo Domingo, and has England in Ireland and Egypt and India. The kind of law and order, however, that Christ advocated, does not need the assistance of the mailed fist to maintain it.

Father Macksey refers to the "state that is willing to undertake the punishment." You can get almost any nation to undertake that kind of an affair at almost any time, for the munitions makers' lobbyists will persuade the governing powers of the necessity, then prepare material for the newspapers that will justify the maneuver, next get a few Father Mackseys to bless the holy and just cause -- and lo! -- the oppressed have been rescued from deliverance. Had the military kept out of it, and had the oppressed worked with God in place of against Him, certain stocks would drop a few points but the oppressed would have been delivered from bondage.

"Still," Father Macksey says, "the matter is not as clear as the right to interfere in defense of the innocent." What is right is quite clear; what is wrong is equally clear. The fact is that both cases that he cites are wrongs that he is attempting to justify. If you allow the use of physical force for either punitive or defensive purposes, the privilege will be abused. Of course Father Macksey cannot be blamed for the abuse, but it seems that Christ realized how we would abuse authority and so removed the matter of punishment and protection from the power of man to the throne of God.

Lines 213 to 237 of Father Macksey's argument point out that the expansion of trade or the acquisition of new territory gives no title to wage war upon another state to force trade upon her or to extort a measure of her surplus territory. Yet that is just what great powers do in their dealings with smaller nations. It is generally conceded that if Mr. Harding is elected to the presidency of the United States at the coming election, the United States will war upon Mexico for the purpose of annexation. By "generally conceded" I mean that in liberal publications that publish neutral views, and among the thinking public, what I have just related occupies considerable prominence. The fact that I am

in an insane asylum does not mean that I am out of touch with current events. Lunatics are allowed visitors, and since my removal to the Capitol City I have had a goodly number of the right kind of visitors, people who think about something else besides ball games and the movies.

If Cox is elected, we may be just as badly off so far as Mexico is concerned. I have a faint recollection that a certain democrat was elected because "he kept us out of war," but within one month after his inauguration he signed a death warrant for a few hundred thousand souls. America's army can be used for the purpose of forcing our sister republic to join this nation of free people; whether it will be so used is future's secret. We do know, however, that a wide-range agitation has been going on for some years to bring about said annexation. All in the interests of the Mexican people, all for the Mexican people, all for the Mexican people -- and for certain Christians in America and Great Britain.

America's young army drove out the Indians in order to acquire new territory. It was done, of course, for the benefit of the Indians. All wars are waged for the purpose of benefiting those against whom they are directed. That's why we fought Germany -- to benefit the German people. The Germans fought the Allies -- to benefit the oppressed in the allied countries, to bring them under the benign rule of the Fatherland. England's wars against Spain, South Africa, Turkey, and China were for the purpose of uplift. Poland is today fighting Russia because "she has a sincere and true sympathy for the Russian people and wants to help them." Justify the maintenance of a military organization and time will never hang heavy on your hands, there will always be plenty of rescue work; if the rescue work gets slack, the munitions makers will save you the bother of finding something to do for they have an excellent propaganda system, thoroughly Christian in every detail.

Lines 222 to 225 contain a statement that seems to have a marked relevancy to certain situations existing in many places throughout the Christian world today. It reads: "Much less may a just title be found in the mere need of exercising a standing martial force, of reconciling a people to the tax for its maintenance, or to escape revolutionary trouble at home." Ireland and Santo Domingo ought to shake hands with Father Macksey. Too, we have somewhat of a standing army in the United States today; it is only four times -- approximately -- its pre-war size. While Father Macksey does not justify "a standing martial force," etc., yet, if his previous declarations are true, it becomes necessary that we keep up to date, otherwise somebody is liable to jump over the international fence and bump us off when we're not looking for it.

The essence of lines 238 to 266 is contained in the first two lines, which read: "Furthermore, a clear title is limited to the condition that war is necessary as a last appeal."

Since the "last appeal" argument has been answered, we will not bother with it again.

The last three lines of the section just referred to, that is: lines 264, 265, 266 read: " Towards this solution of international differences, in spite of the difficulty of securing an unbiased tribunal, we have in the last fifty years made some progress." I suppose that Father Macksey has reference to efforts made along the lines of the Hague Tribunal. Let us briefly review the work of this organization:

In the city of The Hague, Netherlands, in the year 1899, the Hague Peace Council was established in what is known as the Peace Palace, erected at a cost of millions of dollars, ten millions of which were donated by Andrew Carnegie.

A peace propaganda was inaugurated with a view to establishing world peace. That the great nations of the world were interested in the movement is evidenced by the part they played in the peace undertakings in general and donations to the Peace Palace. The grand stained glass windows in the Court of Justice came from England; the massive gates at the park entrance from Germany; the gorgeous marbles of the interior from Italy; the silk tapestries in the Council Chamber from Japan; the priceless porcelain vases from China; a marble throne from Greece; Gobelin tapestries from France; a vase of jasper from Russia; marble statuary from the United States; costly carpets from Turkey; with minor gifts from all the minor nations of the world.

Within a few short years, five of the monarchs and presidents whose pictures adorn the pompous walls of the Peace Palace, were laid under six feet of earth in conformity with the cold, shrill dictum of an assassin's bullet. "Their house was built upon sand."

The great rulers of the world sit upon an International Tribunal of Arbitration at The Hague. A magnificent marble hall was built for the delegates to deliberate in. A library on international peace consisting of 75,000 volumes with all known cases of arbitration codified, was placed at the disposal of those charged with the duty of settling disputes between nations. And an international committee of eminent statesmen was formed, supplemented by a body of permanent judges, the personnel of which was made up of experienced jurists, who convene at the Hague for purposes of international arbitration.

With an organization of such magnitude, devoted solely to the maintenance of peace, one would think that wars were at an end. But, within fifteen years after the investiture of the Peace Guardians, a hurricane of war stormed over the tranquil universe; five of the eight greater powers of the world flew at each other's throats; their activities were soon supplemented by other nations

great and small; and hundreds of millions of human beings -- mostly Christians -- were involved in murderous conflict upon land, in the air and on and under the water. Within a short time the greatest war in history reached its zenith.

Had unalloyed Christianity permeated the proceedings of The Hague, they could have profitably dispensed with the 75,000 volumes on international peace, substituting therefore the simple truthful Word of God found in the New Testament. By insistently cleaving to the rules that Christ laid down, just as the builder executes the architect's designs, peace would crown their efforts. It is criminal folly to labor for peace in any other manner.

Christ's simple entreaty: "Overcome evil with good" is infinitely more dynamic for giving mobility to the machinery of Peace than the 75,000 volumes in the gilded library of The Hague. Stained glass windows of faith; massive gates of hope; gorgeous marbles of charity; tapestries of love; porcelain vases made from materials of pure friendship and sincerity; a marble throne of forbearance and forgiveness; a vase of kindliness and brotherhood; marble statuary of adamantine good will; priceless carpets of free trade upon which nations will tread in a harmony destructive of the "commercial rivalries" that President Wilson spoke of in a recent speech in Kansas City; and myriad reverential relationships that will evolve from practicing the virtues enumerated will construct a Peace Palace sublimely more beautiful in God's sight than that of the mundane Hague. And, its potency in establishing world peace will transcend mere man's noblest and mightiest efforts.

Many Christians are laboring diligently to construct such a temple. Will you help or will you hinder? Your decision will determine whether your life on earth is to be a success or a failure.

Lines 267 to 281: "Again, the question of proportion between the damages to be inflicted by war and the value of the national right menaced or violated must enter into consideration for the determination of the full justice of a title. Here we must take into account the consequences of such right being left unvindicated. Nations are prone to go to war for almost any violation of right, and its reparation absolutely refused. This tendency argues the common conviction that such violation will go from bad to worse, and that, if sovereign right is not recognized in a small thing, it will be far less so in a great. The conviction is not without rational ground; and yet the pride of power and the sensitiveness of national vanity can readily lead, in the excitement of the moment, to a mistaken judgment of a gravity of offence proportionate to all the ills of war."

Answer: By adopting the plan of forgiving injuries, we will save ourselves the need of splitting hairs to determine the proportions between damages to be inflicted and the right menaced. Forgive those who wrong us, and God will see to it that we are paid

in full. I have been unjustly and illegally imprisoned for more than two years. The remedy is not to sue for damages, but to forgive. If I had an army strong enough to inflict punitive punishment, such infliction would not right the wrong. Forgiveness is the way to settle it; then God will handle the matter from there on.

I trust that you have noted how Father Macksey admitted that pride of power and national vanity can lead to war. It often does so lead. Christian humility, Christian reliance upon God's power rather than upon armies, is an effective restraint in cases such as Father Macksey had in mind.

Lines 281 to 285: "Neither is force a successful means of securing honor, unless it be to assure the due recognition of the rights of the sovereign power behind that honor; while in the calm forum of deliberate reason the loss of one human life outweighs the mere offended vanity of a king or a people."

Answer: The foregoing is an argument against war rather than for it. So far as honor is concerned, however, the best manner of preserving the nation's honor is to avoid dishonoring God. To obey God's laws is to honor Him, and to honor God is to honor the nation that is or should be dedicated to Him.

Lines 285 to 303 deal with weighing the cost of the war in blood and treasure. The substance is contained in lines 293 to 298 which read: "Finally, a state going to war must weigh its own probable losses in blood and treasure, and its prospect of victory, before it may rightly enter upon a war: for the interests of the common good at home inhibit the exercise of force abroad, unless reasonably calculated not to be an ultimate graver loss to one's own community."

Answer: Those who declare war are generally certain of victory. Each side is sure it will win, just as two prizefighters go into the ring claiming victory. Since our fighting forces are superior in skill if not in number (says each side to itself) we are certain of an early triumph. We will then compel the enemy to pay an adequate indemnity, and the war will have cost us nothing aside from a few men. Usually, one side wins, and so there is not "an ultimate graver loss to that side's own community." But, how about the loss sustained by the opposite side, the side that got whipped? Bear in mind we cannot rise by causing others to fall. "With what measure you mete, it shall be measured to you again."

Lines 304 to 340 "cover what may be done by the warring power in exercise of its right, embraces the infliction of all manner of damage to property and life, etc." Father Macksey places certain limits on "wanton destruction" but later excuses it if it will minister to the maintenance or help of the army indulging in the wanton destruction. Briefly stated, his argument grants the right of using physical force coercively in a most aggressive manner. Lines 330 and 331 read: "That 'war is hell,' in the sense that it

inevitably carries with it a maximum of human miseries, is true." This is another argument against war rather than for it. Christ's coming upon earth was anything but for the purpose of making us more miserable. The Master said that He came in order that we might have life and have it more abundantly. "My yoke is sweet and My burden is light," does not presage the inevitability of a maximum amount of human miseries. Which indicates that since "war is hell" and since it "inevitably carries with it a maximum of human miseries" it must be without the pale of Christianity, for Christianity "inevitably carries with it a yoke that is sweet and burden that is light." Human miseries are not sweet, nor is such a burden light; then what must be "a maximum of human miseries"?

I am perfectly willing to admit that Father Macksey is wrong.

"Do not think that I came to send peace upon earth: I came not to send peace, but the sword." Matthew 10: 34. These words of Christ are often quoted by the militarists as proof that Christ favored slaying when "necessary." The verse following that was just quoted reads: "For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. And a man's enemies shall be they of his own household." Surely these words make it clear that wars must be. I was getting along quite nicely with my case against Father Macksey, but this sword business and the disruption in households appears to have given me something that I cannot answer. But an explanation of the text that is printed in a footnote on the bottom of the page gives the explanation of the Catholic church, which explanation is sufficiently authoritative to convince any doubting Thomas who might still feel that he is justified in quarrels and in warfare. The footnote reads: "Ver. 35. I came to set a man at variance, etc. Not that this was the end or design of the coming of our Saviour; but that His coming and His doctrine would have this effect, by reason of the obstinate resistance that many would make, and of their persecuting all such as should adhere to Him." Such is the explanation appearing in the Catholic Bible.

Lines 341 to 348: "A doubt might arise about the obligation to spare wounded and prisoners, the guardianship or care of whom would prevent immediate further prosecution of the war at perhaps its most auspicious moment, or their dismissal but replenish the forces of the enemy. The care of the wounded might be waived, as its obligation is not of justice but of charity, which yields to a superior claim of one's own benefit: but the killing of prisoners presents a different problem."

Answer: A situation that makes it necessary to kill a wounded, defenseless soldier because of what you consider a "superior claim" of your own benefit seems to be a situation that a Christian ought to avoid getting into. And the best way to avoid getting into it is to keep out of war. If war were right,

everything incident to its successful prosecution would be right. That that is fundamentally right never reaches a point in its unfoldment where it faces the alternative of either resulting in wrong or checking its advance toward the ultimate. That that is fundamentally right continues to be so to the end, and if such were not the case, the proposition would either be wrong or a mixture of right and wrong. "If a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand." -- Mark 3:25.

Every war is a series of killing those who have been wounded. They have to get them out of the way. Can anything be more cowardly than shooting or bayoneting a helpless cripple? It is worse than cowardly, it is a detestable crime, but "orders are orders." You approach the wounded man, he looks up at you pitifully, he is not your enemy, he has nothing against you, but he responded to his country's call. He is now helpless, cannot harm you, and cannot defend himself. Perhaps he is thinking of his wife and children; perhaps he longs to return home and care for that gray-haired mother who has toiled and suffered for him for all these long years; perhaps he is determined to do his bit when he gets back home to put an end to wars, to prevent wars. But, "orders are orders" so you pull out your trench-knife -- as the blood spurts from his jugular, you approach the next victim.

Take in the case of all wars, there are thousands who object to going, but, they obey. You will remember the conversation that Lt. Col. Goodale and I had at Fort Douglas. He said he believed that German conscientious objectors should do as the Kaiser told them and go to war for their country. Suppose Goodale met one of these on the battlefield after the fighting had temporarily stopped, and it was considered a "most auspicious moment" as Father Macksey refers to it. You know the rest. Goodale is a soldier, he obeys orders, he would not take time to consider that that German lad was forced into the army just as the American government has forced thousands into the American army by means of brutality or intimidation or both.

Nearly all moments are considered "most auspicious" to the commanders of both sides.

Getting back to Father Macksey's argument about "a superior claim of one's own benefit." Christ was fighting a battle with death and the Devil. If he had considered "His own benefit" you and I would indeed be miserable today. The argument of "one's own benefit" can be discussed from many angles, but we may as well dispose of it quickly by simply holding aloof from an institution that compels such a choice.

Lines 348 to 367 deal with the attempt of international law to "lessen the waste of human life and the miseries of warfare." Commendable! A good way, however, to cure boils, is to cleanse the blood. Remove the cause of war -- failure to practice Christianity -- and the effects will disappear. In the section that I have

just referred to, Father Macksey says "that the history of wars is full of excesses." Quite true. But the excesses are not the kinds that come from practicing Christianity to excess. To resort to excesses as a Christian would be to make sacrifices for humanity like Christ and the saints have made. War's excesses are sacrifices against humanity. To avoid these excesses -- stay out of war!

One time the Denver singletaxers were having a little dinner, as singletaxers often do. This dinner happened to be served just a short time after the outbreak of the war in 1914. Mr. Annear, an Agnostic, and I, a Christian, were discussing the war when he remarked: "After two-thousand years of Christianity, when the crisis came it failed." I replied that it was not Christianity that failed, but the lack of it. Mr. Annear's opinion was quite logical, from the viewpoint of an Agnostic. It is perfectly natural for one to expect Christians to practice what they profess to believe. I have cited this instance because I believe that Mr. Annear expressed the view of practically all those outside the fold of the Christian religion. The point is: those who are not Christians, but who know what the Christian religion teaches, perceive quite clearly that we are either inconsistent or hypocritical. I dare not say insane, because people living in glass houses should not throw stones, and, judging from my present habitation, it would hardly do for me to say those who disagree with me are insane, for they are on the outside looking into the insane asylum while I am on the inside of the insane asylum wishing that I were out. Appearances are against me, so I will try to refrain from suggesting insanity as the reason for the Christians participating in a game that history records as being full of "excesses."

Not long ago the New York World published a letter written by a New York Chinaman, which letter was reprinted in the Denver Catholic Register. It reads: "If a Chinaman may be permitted to suggest, would it not be possible to found a better and more lasting peace upon the Ten Commandments than upon the Fourteen Points¹³? ... Why does not the West now, after 1900 years, try the experiment of founding a state upon the teaching of its Christ? We Chinamen believe that trade restrictions beget war. The West has been at war for and because of its markets ever since this modern civilization was created.

"When the guns of Germany worked destruction to the cathedrals of France, we heard you weeping aloud in your marketplaces because of the architectural beauties of Rheims and Louvain. Not one voice was raised in honest protest because of the desecration of the Inner Tabernacle. I attack not your Christian religion, nor would I compare it unfavorably with our Confucianism. You, however, do not practice your religion. With you a commercial relation comes first in all things; the moral relation is forgotten. Lasting peace will come only when you accept honestly the teachings of Christ whom you now only pretend to worship."

Last Sunday I heard my first Mass in the insane asylum. It was attended mostly by guards, nurses, attendants, etc. How many actually insane persons were there I do not know, but I was there. After Mass I went to see the priest -- Father Diekamp -- and asked him if he could get a certain book from the library for me. I must have looked "dippy" to him because he talked to me just about as I imagine I would talk to an insane person if I were sane. This, however, is not what I want to write about principally. Father Diekamp's sermon was on the love of our neighbor. I thought that rather strange, although I did not say anything about it to Father. I listened to his sermon very intently. And I could not help reflecting that surely something must be wrong with me mentally, because I had been advocating the very doctrine that Father Diekamp was now preaching from the altar, and I was put in jail for living according to that doctrine, and after twenty-six months in prison I was shipped to this insane asylum because I had not been cured of that belief. And then to go to Mass for the first time in months -- no services at Fort Douglas -- and hear a sermon on "love thy neighbor" -- I tell you it struck me queer.

Father Diekamp said that we should love our neighbor as ourselves for many reasons, the principal of which are: first, God loves them and we should love them for God's sake; secondly, God died on the cross for our neighbors as well as for ourselves. All this seemed quite reasonable, and I wondered why I was in the insane asylum. Father's peroration, however, indicated that my "judgment was defective" in some particular, although I could not just figure it out. "We should set an example so that people would say: 'see how the Christians love one another'" was the main point in Father Diekamp's closing remarks. Mr. Annear the Agnostic, and the Chinaman whose letter I quoted, and hundreds of millions of others who are not Christians have been observing "how the Christians love one another" and they (the observers) seem to think that wholesale slaughter of one another is a rather anomalous manifestation of love. Just a case of "defective judgment" though, for if non-Christians would reason as Father Macksey reasons they could very easily understand that organized killing of our Christian and non-Christian brothers is the proper thing whenever it is "necessary."

As we approached the Communion rail, the choir sang that beautiful hymn so loved by every Catholic heart, in which the words appear: "Permit me to receive Thee and trust the world to you." We are willing to trust the world to Him while going to and coming from the reception of Holy Communion, but once we get on the outside of the church we lose heart in the power of God, get real practical, and transfer our trust to the army and navy.

Lines 367 to 390 are devoted to an attack upon "lying, direct deception, bad faith and treachery" in war. They are condemned by Father Macksey as "intrinsically immoral." Again we agree, Father Macksey! But, since you justify war,

the circumstances of war compel toleration of the evils just mentioned. Not that it is necessary to indulge in them in order to carry on warfare, but the enemy -- from the viewpoint of both sides -- invariably resorts to such tactics, and, since you are opposing war with war, you feel the urgency of opposing lying with lying, deception with deception, bad faith with bad faith, treachery with treachery. The history of wars proves that this is done on both sides. Such is the psychology of the military mind. If, however, the evil of war were being overcome with the good example of a Christian living Christ's doctrine of peace, then lying would be overcome with truth, deception with honesty, bad faith with fair dealing, treachery with fealty; in short evil would be overcome with good.

Tom Tynan has become famous for his success in reforming criminals. As warden of the Colorado State Penitentiary, he introduced the plan of overcoming evil with good. He has built up a system of reformation that is unassailable in every particular, and his system has produced marvelous results. Only a few penal institutions have copied after him, the others preferring the brutal, starvation, mistreatment methods which have long since proven that they make bad men worse instead of making good men out of those who strayed from the righteous course. Contrast the Jefferson City penitentiary so thoroughly exposed by Mrs. Kate Richards O'Hare with that of the Colorado institution. Is it because we wish to be more brutal to the weaker sex that we tolerate the persecution of those unfortunate women in Jefferson City? That cannot be the explanation, because we treat men just as badly. The secret is that Christians are afraid to adopt the Christian plan of Tom Tynan's, just as they are afraid to adopt the Christian plan of dealing with international criminals. Yes, it is absolute cowardice. If they were not afraid they would do what is clearly the right thing. Tom Tynan and others have proved that the best results can be obtained by treating individual criminals according to Christ's prescription of overcoming evil with good. William Penn and others have proved that the best results can be obtained by treating international criminals according to Christ's prescription of overcoming evil with good.

Line 373 of Father Macksey's argument on war reads: "No end justifies an immoral means." If war and all that it leads into is not immoral, let us hope that the world is never visited with anything that justifies that appellation.

Having previously considered the argument from lines 367 to 390, we have now reached and will deal with lines 391 to 397 which read: "In the terms of readjustment after victory, the victorious state, if its cause was just, may exact full reparation of the original injustice suffered, full compensation for all its own losses by reason of the war, etc."

Answer: Victorious armies are always sure that their cause was just, "otherwise" they say "God would not have blessed us with victory." Germany was sure that her cause was just

in 1870-71 and she proved her love for France by the imposition of such a crushing indemnity that Bismarck was awarded his proud cognomen of "The Iron Chancellor." France was sure that her cause was just in 1914-18 and she proved her love for Germany by returning the latter's favor so unwelcomely received some years previously. Nations do not always get an opportunity to repay compliments in that manner, but always and everywhere the winning side is certain that its cause was just.

France would have appreciated a little mercy at the hands of the Germans in '71, but, according to Father Macksey, Germany was entitled to "full reparation, full compensation, and proportionate penalty." Germany would have appreciated a little mercy at the hands of the French in '18, but, according to Father Macksey, France was entitled to "full reparation, full compensation, and proportionate penalty." Since France is a Christian nation and having experienced the sting of a piercing indemnity nearly 50 years ago, you would think that she would remember how a little compassion would have eased her pain. Then, pondering over Christ's exhortation to "do unto others as you would have them do unto you," you would think that France would "go easy" on Germany. But the philosophy of war is not the philosophy of Christianity. France has done no worse with Germany than, all things considered, victorious nations are wont to do. The only way to abolish such "excesses" is to remove the cause. Christ has told us how to remove it.

Lines 397 to 401 read: "In the execution of such judgment the killing of surviving contestants or their enslavement, though, absolutely speaking, these might fall within the measure of just punishment, would today seem to be an extreme penalty, and the practice of civilization has abolished it."

Answer: Civilization evidently put one over on Father Macksey's type of Christianity. If "absolutely speaking" such punishment is "just punishment" what right has so-called civilization to abolish it? although I admit that civilization is playing a noble part in abolishing the kind of Christianity that Father Macksey defended as "just punishment," yet I was wondering where it derived its authority.

Beginning with line 401, Father Macksey takes up the question of punishment inflicted in the days of the Old Testament. This needs no discussion, so we will proceed to lines 413 to 422 which read: "The appropriation of a part of the territory of the vanquished may quite readily be a necessity of payment for reparation of injury and loss, etc. ... The history of nations, however, would indicate that this exaction was enforced far oftener than it was justified by proportionate necessity." In other words, the history of nations indicates that the victors have wronged the vanquished. If war is right, how did it happen to evolve into a wrong?

Of course an individual or a nation can be doing the right thing up to a certain point and then begin to do wrong, and that would not prove that they had been doing wrong from the beginning. But the same commanders who prosecuted the war justify the exactions that you claim are not justified, and they use your logic to justify themselves. You state: "In the terms of readjustment after victory, the victorious state, if its cause was just, may exact full reparation of the original injustice suffered, full compensation for all its own losses by reason of the war, proportionate penalty to secure the future not only against the conquered state, but, through fear of such penalty, even against other possibly hostile states." You have given them all the rope they need, but in place of hanging themselves, they hang the conquered nation.

How different is your proposal of demanding reparation, compensation and penalty, with Christ's doctrine of forgiveness. Since, however, you would not forgive in the beginning, it can hardly be expected that you would forgive after still greater damage is done.

Lines 423 to 468 cover the question of the "term of the right of war, etc., " and all this has been previously answered.

Lines 469 to 479, which conclude the argument, reiterate or sum up the justification of a "just" war. All this has been previously answered.

To repeat what I previously said about a "just" war: both sides to every war that was ever fought or ever will be fought, are sure that they are fighting a "just" war, and they can justify their entry into the war and the prosecution of it with the argument of Father Macksey. But, since the justice of man cannot dethrone the justice of God, there is no such animal as a "just war." I have produced some evidence and will produce considerably more to prove that Christianity and war are antithetical philosophies. And the testimony that I produce from now on to prove that war and military preparation against war are in opposition to Christianity will apply not only specifically as answers to the particular arguments that I produce for refutation, but in general to Father Macksey's justification of war. I have, however, given as much space to Father Macksey's argument and the answering of it specifically as would seem necessary.

Before proceeding with the introduction of more testimony against war, I will, as I said previously, show, by way of analogy, that one has a right to question the Catholic hierarchy. That it is not only a right but also a duty. My analogy will be defective in one particular though, for I am going to instance the case of a priest who was excommunicated for advocating a doctrine contrary to the views of his ecclesiastical superiors, but who was six years later reinstated to the priesthood without retracting.

On page 573 of the Catholic Encyclopedia appears a treatise on Justice, which declares that, among other things, "unearned increment" belongs to the owner of land. Some years ago Father McGlynn attacked this doctrine, advocating in its stead the application of what Henry George styled the single tax. Single tax would take the unearned increment for the community because it is a community value and belongs to the community.

For instance: I buy a vacant lot in the heart of the city for a certain sum. I hold the title to that lot, but I do not hold any title to its increase in value by reason of the community's industry. Other people build stores, factories, etc., and within ten years my vacant lot is worth several times what I paid for it. Under our present system, my neighbors increased the value of my land and I get the benefit of the increase. Under single tax the increase in value would go to the community that produced it. So, I dispute the correctness of the aforementioned treatise on Justice, which declares that unearned increment belongs to the owner of land. In support of my contention I refer to the fact, as previously stated, that Father McGlynn was excommunicated from the Catholic priesthood for espousing the proposal that I have just briefly outlined. After a six-year struggle, this good priest was finally reinstated in the year 1893. He did not retract a single utterance nor recant in any manner whatsoever. Moreover, he continued to advocate until the day of his death, the doctrine for which he had at one time suffered excommunication.

Since I justly attack the attitude of the Catholic Encyclopedia on the question of unearned increment, I am surely entitled to attack its stand on war or any other subject that I have good reason to believe is erroneously presented. I do not, however, know of any other subject upon which we differ, but if there were a difference of opinion, and the circumstances were as grave as those in the present instance, it would be my right and my duty to present the evidence.

For convenience we will consider war, military preparation against war, navalism, and militarism all under the heading of war, because all these things are directly or indirectly a part of war. "Preparedness," as it is called, has always resulted in war; not an instance in the world's history where it prevented war continuously. Sooner or later preparedness brings on war, and the greater the preparedness the greater the war.

We have already considered the command to not kill, so we will examine other evidences of Christianity in their relation to war.

In Matthew 5:30 we read: "And if thy right hand scandalize thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee: for it is expedient for thee that one of thy members should perish, rather than that thy whole body go into hell." The footnote in the Catholic Bible gives the following interpretation: "That is, if

it be a stumbling block, or occasion of sin to thee. By which we are taught to fly the immediate occasions of sin, though they be as dear to us, or as necessary as a hand or an eye."

Oftentimes we feel that war is more necessary than a hand or an eye, "for" we say, "if we do not go to war we will not only lose a hand or an eye but we will lose our life."

To do away with our army and navy will cause many to suffer a financial loss. But it is better that they suffer this loss than to lose their souls. In the long run, they will not notice much if any difference in their ability to earn a living, and the blessings that will accompany a Christian occupation will compensate for any hardships caused by the change. Every advance has seemingly injured some particular class, but in reality it has not injured anybody, merely caused a little shifting around, although the shifting was painful to some for a time. The advent of the railroads put the stagecoach drivers out of business, but the railroads facilitated travel and transportation and resulted in the employment of thousands where hundreds were employed before. Automobiles have interfered with the occupation of horse raisers and wagon makers, but autos have resulted in providing employment for more persons than were employed in the industry that autos supplanted.

An era of peace would cause the myriad forces, that are now engaged in destruction and preparation for destruction, to enlist in constructive enterprises. There are millions upon millions of hungry people to be fed, and millions upon millions of underclothed people to be properly clothed, and hundreds of millions hungering for Christ's gospel. Great is the demand for genius, Christian genius. And the work of helping others is a work that all would enjoy. The work of harming others is a work that even those who profit from it financially cannot benefit. Take Carnegie as an example: He amassed a great fortune, considerable of it was from the sale of war material. He donated ten million dollars to the Peace Foundation, but went on with the manufacture of war material. The outbreak of the European war shattered his ideals, and, to use a colloquial expression, "broke his heart." It is claimed that the failure of the Hague Tribunal to avert war affected his health, he lived unhappily and died prematurely. If Carnegie had devoted his talent and his wealth to removing the causes of war, he would have lived happier, perhaps longer, and, best of all, he would have achieved his objective. One cannot advance the cause of peace with one hand while with the other hand he engages in the manufacture of war's requisites. What is true of Carnegie is true of all Christians who today are praying for peace but preparing for war.

"Trust in God but keep your powder dry," is an expression attributed to Theodore Roosevelt¹⁴, I believe. It is indicative of the general spirit abroad in the world today. If you are keeping powder for the purpose of using it for war, moreover, if you are keeping it particularly dry in order

that you will be ready for instant war, then you are not trusting in God, you are trusting in the power of the powder to save you.

"And in those days cometh John the Baptist preaching in the desert of Judea. And saying: Do penance; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand!" Matt. 3:1,2. Such was the exhortation of Christ's precursor. Take notice that John did not say to inflict penance. When we go to war we are not doing penance but we are inflicting penance upon others. Of course one also suffers himself in going to war -- sometimes. It frequently happens that a man goes to war, enjoys the excitement, profits from the diversion, kills a great number and wounds others, and comes home safe and sound and hearty. I have talked with a great number of such as these. Now, concerning those that themselves suffer while at the same time causing others to suffer: it may be properly argued that they are doing penance, but they are at the same time inflicting penance. St. John did not say to do penance and to inflict penance.

"And the people asked him, saying: What shall we do? And he answering, said to them: He that hath two coats, let him give to him that hath none; and he that hath meat, let him do in like manner," is the anti-war lesson we learn from St. John in Luke 3:10,11. According to the custom of the wealthy people in those days, they were clad in two tunics. And, as is the case today, many persons were without even one tunic. Now, St. John cannot be accused of being ignorant of war. And, if his admonitions did not apply to the people in all the affairs of life, why did he fail to specify the exception? The wealthy people in wartime, instead of dividing their riches with the poor on the enemy side, buy liberty bonds in order to enable the government to send more shells to the front. Incidentally, if the government is solvent, they get interest on the money invested in liberty bonds.

In the same chapter of Luke, we read of St. John: "And the soldiers also asked him, saying: And what shall we do? And he said to them: Do violence to no man; neither calumniate any man; and be content with your pay." How can a war be prosecuted if the soldiers "do violence to no man?" It is quite possible though that this particular passage has reference to municipal police, rather than to soldiers engaged in the profession of wholesale slaughter, so I will not attempt to make a point of the passage in so far as its reference to these particular soldiers is concerned. Still, if St. John cautioned municipal police to "do violence to no man" it is quite likely that he would have rebuked a body of genuine army men if the latter had asked "what shall we do?" for, while there is some excuse for maintaining a municipal police force, there is no excuse -- aside from the profit of war -- for maintaining hostile armies who are ready and awaiting the order to go forth and slay each other at the command of those rulers who have some misunderstanding among themselves. I am not defending the establishment of municipal police, but merely pointing out that there is greater justification in having them than in having armies; in the last analysis, however, there is no need for even municipal police, as I will show later on.

The fearlessness of St. John the Baptist should inspire those who today so cowardly cringe at the feet of mammon. Many there are who know that America should disarm; they timorously hold their peace. It is the old, old story of the Pilates fearing they will offend the Caesars. John publicly rebuked Herod for having married his brother's wife Herodias, and in consequence was imprisoned in the fortress of Machaerus. The Catholic clergy condemn divorce today, but it is safer to indulge in such condemnation now than in the early days of Christianity. Without thought of personal safety, John did his duty. I am wondering whether it is innocence or fear that keeps the clergy from today rebuking militarism.

While in fetters, St. John sent some of the disciples who had called upon him to inquire of Jesus whether He was "the One to come, or look we for another?" In that same hour Jesus had wrought many miracles. Answering the inquisitors, He said to them: "Go and relate to John what you have heard and seen: the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are made clean, the deaf hear, the dead rise again, to the poor the gospel is preached." -- Luke 7:22.

This news must have cheered St. John and helped to sustain him in the ordeal through which he soon would pass. Salome, the daughter of Herodias, danced for King Herod and them that were at table with him. Herod was so pleased that he said to the damsel: "Ask of me what thou wilt and I will give it to thee." Her mother, still feeling the sting of John's rebuke, persuaded Salome to ask for the head of John the Baptist. This request made the King sad, for he had begun to like John and did many things at his suggestion. But, because of his promise to Salome, and desirous of not displeasing those who were with him at table, he sent an executioner, John's head was given to Salome on a dish and she took it to her mother. St. Augustine says: "Thus was done to the death the greatest 'amongst them that are born of women,' the prize awarded to a dancing girl, the toll exacted for an oath rashly taken and criminally kept."

The miracles that Christ performed should convince us that He is able to care for us in time of war if we will abide by His wishes and overcome evil with good in place of returning war for war. St. John braved the executioner in order that he might testify for Christianity. God will give us the grace to do likewise if we put our faith in Him. On the other hand, He may not call upon us to make the supreme sacrifice; but if we must die for the faith such an ending is better than living in sin.

What St. Augustine said of St. John's execution applies in certain ways to participation in war. "The toll exacted for an oath rashly taken and criminally kept" can truthfully be said of many acts committed in the name of a "just war." And "the prize awarded to a dancing girl: reminds us of the prize awarded to munitions manufacturers who call upon soldier lads to slay their brothers in Christ.

With St. John, the Catholic clergy of today assail divorce. But, unlike St. John, they do not seem to lay very great stress upon a division of wealth, or of doing violence to no man. Perhaps St. John was suffering from "defective judgment" in these particular instances.

So many argue that since war was right in the days of the Old Testament, it is right at the present time. Father Macksey made it clear that there is a vast distinction, and he proved that today we have not the right that they had in the time when people were governed by a Theocracy.

Divorce was permitted in the days of the Old Testament, but it has not been permitted since the time of Christ. Non-Catholic churches -- most of them -- still allow divorced persons to remarry, but the Catholic Church adheres to the scripture in this particular. The Bible makes it equally plain that war is unchristian, although it does not specifically mention war except in that passage where Christ speaks of "wars and rumors of wars" and warns us not to be alarmed but to persevere in living a Christian life.

Nor were miracles performed only in the days of St. John. Long after the Baptist had paid the price of his valor, Christ went about working miracles, even down to the present day. The grotto at Lourdes, the shrine at St. Ann's, the crucifix at Limpias, and numerous other places throughout the world are a continuous manifestation of God's power to perform what we look upon as miracles, but what in reality are perhaps quite in harmony with the laws of nature of which God is the author. Since we know even from present day and every day occurrences that God is able to suspend the element of time and cause a sudden cure, why do we doubt that He could save us from the perils of war? When we have an attack of dyspepsia we do not try to cure it by inducing more dyspepsia; we know that we cannot overcome dyspepsia with dyspepsia. But, when we have an attack of war, despite Christ's entreaty to overcome evil with good we set out to overcome war with war.

"Don't give up the ship" a famous sea fighter shouted to his men. They stayed with the fight and won. If we would adopt the same policy in our battle to overcome the world's wrongs with God's spirit that is in us, we too would win. Success comes only to those who persevere. Constancy will be rewarded with victory. Do not allow the thought of giving up the ship to shatter virtue's continuity. Emerson said that more things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of. The Bible is our compass in crossing life's tempestuous sea. When in doubt, consult the Word of God, steer the ship of life according to His directions, pray with the faith of those who have been rescued from the horrors of bodily ills as they knelt before God's altar in Limpias, Lourdes or elsewhere, and when the evil one urges that you abandon your course fight on and on with a persevering determination to not give up the ship, and success is inevitable. This applies not only to the question of war, but also to every little problem in our daily lives.

I would like at this time to present an argument of an Agnostic friend of mine, against religion. What he, as an outsider, says against the Christians is analogous, in certain respects, to the arguments of Christian-militarists against Christian-pacifists. It will be helpful to present this gentleman's views, first in order that the stand of a religionist may be vindicated, and secondly to show by way of comparison that the attitude of a Christian-militarist is essentially anti-religious. A person cannot be a Christian and a militarist at the same time, but I use the term "Christian-militarist" in order to differentiate between the two classes of Christians.

For convenience I will name this Agnostic friend of mine Smith, since for particular reasons I wish to conceal his identity. The Smith family is rather large, and since the majority has been picking on me for so long a time, I thought it a good chance to get back at a majority name by using it in this discussion.

Smith says: "A person who is religious shows a certain amount of mental dependence, afraid to face life's burdens alone. Those who assert their intellectual independence become Agnostics. First they defy God, then they defy their parents, then they defy society; they are the real rebels. After first dissociating themselves from the traditions, superstitions, conventions and ossifications of religion, then they sever their relations with these elements in society, thus becoming independent. Leaning upon religion indicates weakness, while the self-assertiveness of the agnostic is an expression of strength, mastery, and independence." Thus saith friend Smith.

Answer: St. Paul was not a weakling. Is there any Agnostic who can surpass Jesus Christ in moral courage, strength of character, self-mastery, and independence? Jesus is the Christian's model.

The religionist is "not afraid to face life's burdens alone," but he realizes that this life is not the end but only a means. God not only helps one to bear one's burdens, but in seeking the help and the wisdom of God one is obtaining worth-while assistance and at the same time making an act of Faith. For example: I am in an insane asylum, registered as an insane criminal; at least I am in the ward for the criminally insane; and, if I were not carried on the books as an insane criminal or a criminal who had gone insane, I would be outside the high stone walls and without the iron bars that distinguish my confinement from that of the insane person who enjoys nicer quarters because he is not branded as a criminal. Now, I can get out of this prison, this insane asylum. I have never been in a prison yet out of which I could not make my escape; I could have broken bonds just as so many of my fellow prisoners have; it is not such a difficult matter if one puts his mind to it. Only a few days ago, one of the boys escaped from this prison for the

insane. The reason I do not break jail is because I cannot win my fight that way; it would, in my case, be like running away from battle. I have appealed to relatives and friends, they are doing what they can to effect my release. I appeal to relatives and friends, not because I am afraid to stay in jail, not because I cannot get out of here without their aid, but because the agitation for my release is helpful in the cause, i.e. it helps to focus attention upon opposition to militarism, assists in aiding our movement in its growth from a minority to a majority issue.

The religionist appeals to God, not because he cannot "face life's burdens alone," but because the appeal to God is a help to the cause of the religionist, i.e. it helps him to work out his eternal destiny through co-operation with God in thus manifesting his faith in the Almighty. Later on, I will quote Christ on the necessity of faith. Just now I will say that the appeal to God helps the cause of the religionist not only in things eternal, but also in temporal affairs such as sickness, trouble, etc. Ultimately, God will effect the release of the religionist from the prison of materialism, just as my relatives and friends will ultimately effect my release from the prison that I am in now.

It would seem like foolish bravery for me to stay in prison for years, perhaps die here, while an appeal to those interested in the cause would sooner or later result in my release, and at the same time enable them to agitate on behalf of the cause. To the religionist, it seems like foolish bravery to stay in the prison of darkness for years, perhaps die in darkness, when an appeal to the One interested in his cause will help him while journeying through this life, release him from his prison of darkness and enable him, through the light of faith, to enjoy the freedom of communion with his Creator; then, when the journey is o'er, compensate him for his devotion to God.

The difference between the religionist and the non-religionist is: The former is able to do everything in this world that the latter is able to do, and at the same time he stores up eternal treasure day by day. The latter confines himself within the narrow limits of providing for material needs and doing what he can to help others through various kinds of service, invention, scientific research, etc. In no field of human endeavor has the religionist been outdistanced by the non-religionist. You will find the former holding his own in every walk of life, in science, in the arts, in literature, in commonplace affairs. Go from top to bottom and back up to the top again, search where you will, the religionist has never been bested by the materialist.

Religionists have asserted their "intellectual independence" on more than one occasion, and they continue to assert it. It is not necessary to defy God in order to be intellectually independent. Religion does not make us mental slaves.

On the contrary it compels self-assertiveness and induces independence as essential to its acceptance, because the intellect demands and receives a satisfactory explanation of the need for religion. The Agnostic, through what might be termed either laziness or dependence upon a partial investigation, contents himself with the attitude of neither affirming nor denying God's existence.

It is not advisable to dissociate one's self from traditions that are true. Independent activity of the intellect will discover to us what is true and what is false. "Superstitions" as the term is generally understood, are not a part of religion, therefore we need not stay with them nor leave them. Conventions are in the class of Traditions in the sense in which we are now considering them, i.e. conventions that are the result of truth should be adhered to. In affairs outside the realm of religion, we are quite conventional. As a rule we walk on our feet. It seems to be a convention founded upon the proper method of pedestrian locomotion, so we do not sever diplomatic relations with the earth's surface until the undertaker is ready to do his bit. Too, eating is quite conventional, and while I have become detached from that convention temporarily, I assure you that, if ever I am liberated, I will quickly become addicted to the aforementioned habit. "Ossifications" if they are of the proper kind, are something to adhere to, rather than to cut ourselves away from. The religionist has good reasons to prefer his brand of ossifications to those of the materialist.

I am through with Mr. Smith. I now wish to show the similarity of his attitude with that of the one whom I have styled a Christian-militarist. First, however, I would like to say that Smith the Agnostic is more consistent than the Christian-militarist whom I will name Jones. With apologies to those whose name happens to be Jones, I wish to state that, Smith does not profess Christianity and therefore is neither hypocritical nor simple-minded if he takes part in affairs military. Jones, however, would be insulted if you denied that he is a Christian. I know a large number of Agnostics who, because of common-sense humanitarianism, refused to go to war, served long years in prison and endured a great deal of torture rather than become traitors to their ideals. To me, this appeared to be a case of the Agnostics teaching Christianity to the Christians.

Jones says that a pacifist is afraid to face bullets. I am paraphrasing Smith's argument. I believe that it has already been proved that a Christian does not depend on his religion because he is afraid to face bullets, but because he objects to piercing the breasts of his fellow men with bullets. The C.O.s were urged to take bomb-proof jobs, but they would not consent. The fact is, Jones is afraid to take a stand for genuine Christianity, and the only way he can excuse himself is to call the C.O. a coward.

Like the Agnostic, Jones first defies God. If he were as consistent as Smith the Agnostic, he would then defy his parents and then society. The C.O. is loyal to all three. He

loves and obeys God -- speaking of the Christian C.O. -- he loves and obeys his parents, he obeys the laws of the land except in a case where there is conflict with God's laws.

Jones proudly dissociates himself from the traditions, superstitions, conventions and ossifications of the pacifist. The pacifist adheres to traditions that are inherently Christian, he is not the slave of superstition, gladly conforms to conventions of the early Christians who kept apart from wholesale slaughters of their fellow men. The ossifications he views with the solid comfort of one beholding solid truth. His stand for peace, instead of indicating weakness, is an expression of strength not to be found in those who are whipped into submission by newspaper editorials and scare headlines. He is master of his own destiny in place of the slave of profiteers. He is independent of everything and everybody except God, whereas Jones is a dependent weakling who fears the command of a "superior" officer in the army worse than he does the Day of Judgment.

Which is better: to be an ossified pacifist or a flabby Christian? No doubt you have heard of one William Jennings Bryan. Bryan, as I understand it, is opposed to war. He is opposed to all the wars that did not happen during his life, and he is opposed to all the wars that may take place, for he is firmly of the opinion that war is unchristian and unnecessary. But, like so many good Christians, he was for the particular war that came home to him. It is an easy matter to oppose something at long-distance, but we need the help of God in an especial manner to remain loyal when the fires of temptation surround us at close range. Bryan finally fell and supported the War with Germany. Not because war is right, but because, according to Father Macksey's logic, this particular war was "necessary." Necessary for what? To save us from Christianity!

One time my wife and I went to hear Mr. Bryan lecture on "The Making of a Man." Bryan illustrated the imperfection of man's judgment by recalling the fact that he was a candidate for the presidency on three occasions and "defective judgment" on the part of the public prevented his election. It happened to be the night that Wilson was counted into office because "he kept us out of war" and Bryan said that Mr. Hughes¹⁵ was likely dissatisfied with the people's judgment. He urged us, in order to make certain that we were on the right track, to rely upon Christ's testimony in matters where a difference of opinion might tend to lead one astray.

"Amen I say to you, unless you be converted, and become as little children, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven," is the message of Jesus in Matthew 18:3. Since Christ did not specify any exceptions to this rule of "becoming as little children" we should reflect that children do not organize into armies and slay one another. They want to do so, no doubt, for little children have problems to settle which, to them are of greater importance than world markets are to grown-ups. Little things are

big things to children. But, they seldom even slap each other, much less kill. Mama tells them that good children are good to their neighbors, forgiving, kind, and gentle. Just what God tells the grown-ups. But in order to drill the herd spirit of slaughter into the youngsters' minds we organize them into Boy Scout units, teach them how to hit the bull's eye, march them around in military formation, and preach love of country which the child mind is quick to interpret as meaning that people in other countries are their enemies and deserve to be watched.

In Matthew 18:6 we read: "But he that shall scandalize one of these little ones that believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone should be hanged about his neck, and that he should be drowned in the depth of the sea. Woe to the world because of scandals. For it must needs be that scandals come: but nevertheless woe to that man by whom the scandal cometh."

The footnote in the Catholic Bible states that "scandalize" means putting a stumbling block in the little ones' way and causing them to fall into sin. It also explains that Christ telling us that scandals "must needs be" is in explanation of the wickedness and corruption of the world. I would like to digress long enough to cite the analogy between this scandals must needs be and the affirmation about "wars and rumors of wars." In warning us that there would be "wars and rumors of wars," God did not in advance condone participation therein; in warning us that "it must needs be that scandals come," God did not sanction our giving scandal.

The sinister influence of military psychology to which every Boy Scout is subjected, is one of the greatest stumbling blocks that can be placed in the road of a child. It is during his impressionable years that well-meaning but unconscious emissaries of Satan take the little child and set before it those subtle examples to which his tender mind is so susceptible. Every Boy Scout is a potential murderer whom the munitions manufacturers one day expect to end a fellow man's career at the command of "fire." And, the Catholics are vying with the non-Catholics in the establishment of Boy Scout organizations. One of these fine days the Boy Scouts, having reached maturity, will be marched en masse to the tune: "Onward Christian Soldier, 'Gainst the heathen crew; In the name of Jesus let us shoot them through!"

Boy Scouts could be provided with all the amusements, all the elements of mind and muscle building that they now enjoy without subjecting them to the stumbling block of militarism. They could have drills of various kinds without suggestions of mass attack. If you think the kind of training they now receive does not have the wrong kind of an effect upon them, just watch them in vacant lots and around the alley. After growing to manhood, they will blame, and justly blame, those who them when they were little ones.

We know what war is. Let us make another comparison. Yesterday I was privileged to again attend Holy Mass in the insane

asylum. As on the previous Sunday, Father Diekamp read the Mass and preached the sermon. I did not go to see Father after Mass, for I remembered that he acted toward me on the previous Sunday, just as if I were a little -- or perhaps a great deal -- off center. Accompanied by a guard and still wearing the gay clothes of the institution -- overalls and a checkered jacket -- he could easily spot me as a patient, so, I thought it useless to ask him for that book. Not only useless but dangerous, for if he continued to be bothered by that insane convict from Howard Hall (that is the name of the prison enclosure within the grounds of the insane asylum) he would likely suggest that I be kept in on Sunday mornings. Not a safe thing to have an insane criminal pestering the priest after Mass, because insane criminals have been known to get delusions and make things interesting. Well, Father Diekamp preached a wonderful sermon. I will quote the main points in his sermon and comment upon them afterwards:

1. We have been blest with the supernatural gifts of faith, hope and charity:
 - a. Without faith we cannot hope or trust in God;
 - b. Without faith we cannot have charity, which is love of God and our neighbor.
2. As the drunkard loses his health through intemperance, and as the suicide loses his life through the willful act of self-annihilation, so does the Christian lose faith through willful doubt.
3. Our faith must be humble and it must be active:
 - a. through humility we accept and believe things that our reason cannot fathom;
 - b. Unless our faith is active or lively, it is valueless, for Christ tells us that faith without works is dead, and that not every man who says "Lord, Lord" shall enter the kingdom of heaven but only those who do the will of His Father.
4. Consider what a blessing our faith and our religion is. We differ from the pagans in ways beneficial to ourselves. Christ tells us:
 - a. Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven;
 - b. Blessed are the meek: for they shall possess the land;
 - c. Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.

I have related the points that Father Diekamp dwelt upon in his sermon, and I have quoted him almost word for word. The amplification that follows is made up of my own words, but, in substance, it contains the same message as that that Father Diekamp preached from the altar of God. If it is right, then we should discourage the Boy Scouts in things military.

As Father Diekamp has shown, without faith we cannot trust in God, for we would not believe that He existed. Nor could we love Him in the absence of faith, for the same reason. The very fact that Christians love God and trust in Him is an evidence of faith. Why not carry that faith to its ultimate and believe that He will save us in danger and protect us in case our lives are threatened? The Knights of Columbus distributed during the war, and are still distributing, free of charge, a "Catholic Prayer Book for the Army and Navy." On page 55 there is a "Prayer for Peace" which reads: "O God from Whom are all holy desires, righteous counsels and just works, give to Thy servants that peace which the world cannot give; that our hearts being disposed to keep Thy commandments and the fear of enemies taken away, the times, by Thy protection, may be peaceable." To say this prayer, with faith that it will be granted, is to obtain what we ask for therein, according to the testimony of Christ, which I quoted some pages back. You will remember the condition of forgiveness, though, that Christ laid down. Notice in the prayer just quoted that we say "that... the times, by Thy protection, may be peaceable." A rather queer document to be circulating among members of the army and navy! According to the philosophy of the militarists, the situation is entirely out of the hands of God and our sentiments read thusly. "That the times, by the protection of the army and navy, may be peaceable." The inconsistency of telling God in prayer that we hope for peace through His protection, while at the same time maintaining and putting into use the army and navy, is quite obvious.

There is a prayer for victory on the same page of the aforementioned prayer book. It reads: "O God of battles, Who grantest the victory to those who put their trust in Thee: mercifully hear the prayers of us, Thy servants, that the evil designs of our enemies being defeated, we may praise Thee with unceasing gratitude." The "God of battles" is not necessarily a God of military battles. He is the God of those kinds of battles that St. Paul spoke of when the latter urged that we use the sword of the spirit, which is the Word of God. Notice in the prayer just quoted, the phrase: "Who grantest the victory to those who put their trust in Thee." In military battles, both sides put their trust in God, but both sides cannot win, so, if you think that God is the God of military battles, you are misrepresenting Him by saying that he gives victory to the side that trusts in Him. The prayer for victory is flawless! God does grant victory to those who put their trust in Him, but not to those who put their trust in armies and navies. Note in the prayer the supplication: "that the evil designs of our enemies being defeated." Yes, God will defeat the evil designs of our enemies, provided we trust Him unreservedly; provided we do not follow the Roosevelt idea of "Trust in God but keep your powder dry."

Since, as Father Diekamp truly says, we are blest with supernatural gifts of faith, hope, and charity, let us resolve to extend our faith from the point of merely believing in

God's existence to that of knowing that He has power to defend us from those who temporarily become Satan's instruments; thus we will express hope and trust in God rather than in powder and shells. Moving on to the realm of charity, our dependence upon God's defense will enable us to treat with forgiveness, kindness and love all those that wrong us or attempt to wrong us.

Father Diekamp illustrated the risk of doubting God's power by citing the drunkard and the suicide. The drunkard loses faith in his ability to carry life's burdens, so he drowns his troubles in booze -- that is, he thinks he does. The fact is that by drinking to excess he adds to his troubles, just as the Christian-militarist adds to his troubles in place of disposing of those already distressing him. Understand, I am not presenting a report of Father Diekamp's sermon when I refer to militarism, for he very carefully confined his plea for Christianity to individual affairs of life. As the nation is simply a group of individuals, whatever of Christ's teachings apply to the individuals apply also to the group. Now, the suicide loses faith in his ability to carry life's burdens, but he goes a step farther than the drunkard and commits suicide, just as the militarist, finding that a certain measure of punishment will not defeat the enemy, goes a step farther and commits many atrocities ordinarily condemned in "civilized" warfare, but is excused by Father Macksey in cases where such atrocities in "an auspicious moment" are considered necessary to wring victory from imminent defeat. Just as in the case of the drunkard, the suicide only increases his difficulties. You may still think that as a hunger striker I am committing suicide. If I have not made my stand clear, I will do so before finishing, and I will prove that in the event of my demise it would not be suicide on my part but murder on the part of the authorities responsible for my detention. I will prove this, not only by the logic of my own statements, but also by the introduction of official evidence.

Father Diekamp says that "our faith must be humble and it must be active." This takes us back to what Christ said: "unless you become as little children, you shall not enter the kingdom of heaven." The faith of little children is humble. A child does not understand all that Mama tells him, but he believes her and he does only what she tells him to do, and he refrains from doing that that Mama says is wrong even though he does not comprehend why it is wrong. Yes, our faith must be humble. Just as we humbly believe in the Real Presence, so should we believe in the Real Power, the Power to help, defend, and care for us. Father Diekamp says that our faith is useless unless it be active or lively. Our faith is lively while we are saying that prayer for peace that I quoted from the prayer book issued by the Knights of Columbus, but as soon as we read red letters in the morning paper that tell of a possible war, then our faith transfers its liveliness from God in heaven to the nearest recruiting station. Or we might have enough faith in God to wait until we are drafted, forced into the service, and then as so many Catholic youths told me: "War is wrong, but we cannot help ourselves." Granted! But God can help.

Then Father Diekamp reached that part of his sermon that fairly staggered me. Not because I did not believe him. That was just the trouble, I did believe him. I had heard similar sermons on previous occasions, years ago, preached by God's anointed from His holy altars, and I believed those sermons, and I did my level best to live according to them -- and I landed in the penitentiary first, then the insane asylum. Well, Father explained how thankful we should be for the gift of faith, how Christianity elevated us from the low standards of paganism. "Blessed are the poor in spirit" is the way, Father told us, that Christ made it known that we should not strive for worldly riches. Profiteers take notice. And Father repeated the remainder of the assurance: "for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." He then recited "Blessed are the meek: for they shall possess the land; Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God." As I commented upon these passages early in my argument, I believe it unnecessary to repeat just now.

Father's sermon was strictly anti-war, i.e. it was pro-peace. Had he talked that way during the recent war, he might have been a cellmate of mine. Of course he might escape trouble by carrying water on both shoulders like the Knights of Columbus (K. of C. or K.C.). The K. of C. believe in turning the other cheek. One cheek is for peace, so long as you do not strike it they are for peace. But land a blow or an insult on that cheek and they will "turn the other cheek" just as Christ urged. But the other cheek of the K. of C. is labeled war. So, while the prayer books that they put out contained prayers of peace and gentleness -- as you will observe from the prayers that I quoted -- yet they had another kind of book, a little pocketbook, and out of this little pocketbook they helped to purchase an untimely death for those whom Christ urged us to succor and to love.

I want to quote one more prayer from the Knights of Columbus prayer book, which is entitled a "Prayer for our Enemies" and appears on page 56 of the "Catholic Prayer Book for the Army and Navy." It reads: "O God, Who for Thy great love of this world didst reconcile earth to heaven through Thine only-begotten Son, grant that we, who by the darkness of our sins are turned aside from brotherly love, may by Thy Light shed forth in our souls embrace our friends in Thee and our enemies for Thy sake in a bond of mutual affection: through the same Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord."

Sounds like a seditious utterance. But, admitting that they "turned aside from brotherly love," they proceed to "embrace ... enemies" with shrapnel, and they prove their "affection" for the enemy by affecting him with bayonets, cannon ball, and poison gas. A prayer for unbelievers, on page 57 of the K.C. prayer book contains this passage: "Give them courage to accept the Faith and openly profess it." If I were an unbeliever and observed the Christians professing their Faith openly by openly tearing each other to pieces, I would ask my God: "From such a Faith, O Lord deliver me." But, if I were later to study the Christian religion and learned what a truly grand religion it is,

I would join the fold and preach Christianity to them as I have been and will continue trying to.

How different from the attitude of the Catholics, is that of Eugene V. Debs¹⁶ whom they persecute. As an old man they sent him to prison for ten years -- a life sentence in his case -- for having opposed war. I say "they sent him to prison" because if the Catholics or any other large body of Christians would live as Christianly as Debs lives, it would be impossible to crucify righteousness in any such manner. As it is, the Catholics were in the mob that demanded Debs' incarceration. Said Debs just before going to the penitentiary: "I am opposed to bloodshed in any form. A revolution is coming, but it must be peaceful. That is the reason I am opposed to war, to making men soldiers. A soldier is a human being trained to kill other human beings. I don't believe in killing. I am opposed to it ... I can go to the gallows with a smile on my face, without a quiver, but I'll never have the stain of any man's blood upon my hands. I'm opposed to all forms of murder. We must do our work comrades, peacefully. We are slowly but surely welding the iron ring about our exploiters. But, because they have treated us cruelly and like cattle that is not the spirit in which we must treat with them. We must be gentle and ask God to forgive them. They speak of Americanizing the foreigners -- why? To make strikebreakers of them! God forgive them! When I am gone, the richest gift I ask, is that some child will lay a flower upon my grave and say: 'Gene did something for me.'"

One thing certain: It can never be said of Debs that he scandalized the little ones. In Debs' speech to the jury that sentenced him to prison, he said: "From what you heard in the address of the counsel for the prosecution, you might naturally infer that I am an advocate of force and violence. It is not true. I have never advocated violence in any form. I always believed in education, in intelligence, in enlightenment, and I have always made my appeal to the reason and to the conscience of the people."

Now, returning to Bryan's proposal, in connection with all that has been written since I referred to his speech on "The Making of a Man," I will ask you to reflect that he urged us to rely upon Christ's testimony in matters where a difference of opinion might tend to lead one astray. I believe that I have not quoted Bryan's exact words, for it has been nearly four years since he made that speech and I do not remember his exact words. I have, however, recited the substance of his statement. It is plain from what I have since quoted from Christ, from Father Diekamp and from the Knights of Columbus' prayer book for the army and navy that we should not participate in war, because war is not an of love for our neighbor, shows lack of faith in God, indicates that we trust in the efficacy of crack gunmen and plenty of ammunition rather than in the grace and the power of God, and scandalizes the little children by setting them a bad example. "But," you will say, "when the State orders its subjects to go to war, we must obey."

Well, let us see whether we should obey. The State came into existence long after God commanded the individual to not kill. In his dissertation on war, Father Macksey has made it plain that we are not justified in defending war upon the ground that there was war in the days of the Old Testament, so I need not refute that fallacy in case you had it in mind. When you and I came into this world, we did not make any alignment with the State -- some of us still dispute its right and its authority as at present constituted, although we tolerate it in so far as we can do so without offending God --, and the State had no moral right to compel us to become a party to its dealings, particularly its immoral dealings. Coming into the world, we owed allegiance to no person or group of persons in so far as their right to at a later date order us to do what we believed to be wrong was concerned. Our only obligation was and is to God; if we can still serve God and at the same time acquiesce in the demands of the State, well and good.

After considerable effort extending over a number of days, I finally succeeded, through the kind assistance of Messrs Fihelly and Kelly of the Knights of Columbus, in procuring some books containing valuable data among which was volume 14 of the Catholic Encyclopedia which has an article on the State and Church written by our esteemed friend Father Charles Macksey, S.J., the same priest who wrote the essay on war. Says Father Macksey on page 251: "In all subject-matter not purely spiritual nor purely temporal, but at the same time both spiritual and temporal in character, both jurisdictions may enter, and so entering give occasion to collision, for which there must be a principle of solution. In case of direct contradiction, making it impossible for both jurisdictions to be exercised, the jurisdiction of the Church prevails, and that of the State is excluded. The reason of this is obvious: both authorities come from God in fulfillment of His purposes in the life of man; He cannot contradict Himself; He cannot authorize contradictory powers. His real will and concession of power is determined by the higher purposes of His Providence and man's need, which is the eternal happiness of man, the ultimate end of the Church. In view of this end God concedes to her the only authority that can exist in the case in point."

Since "both authorities (Church and State) come from God in fulfillment of His purposes in the life of man," and since a "collision" happens between these authorities which require a "principle of solution," it is plain that the State sometimes errs, otherwise there would be no "collision," for, as God "cannot contradict Himself," the fact of a "collision" between the Church and State is proof of the fallible contradicting the infallible. "Wars," according to those participating, "are fought for the glory of God and the good of man, therefore they are not purely spiritual nor purely temporal, but at the same time both spiritual and temporal in character," as Father Macksey refers to such subject-matter, and I submit that since the State asks the citizen to take up arms, which is contrary to God's law, there is a collision in jurisdiction and the citizen should refuse. I will

produce still more evidence to prove that resort to arms is against God's law.

The Knights of Columbus' prayer book contains a "Prayer Before Action" which is a quotation from Psalms 22 and 23 and reads: "The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the defence of my life: of whom shall I be afraid? The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want. Yea, though I should walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: For Thou art with me. Surely Thy mercy shall follow me all the days of my life." As I told you before, this prayer book has been published for free distribution among the soldiers and sailors. If it is not a seditious document -- from the viewpoint of patrioteers -- I would like to know what is. Think of them styling that prayer a "Prayer Before Action." Just what it is! If that prayer were recited by those trusting in God, and recited with faith, they would need no further action against the enemy. It is quite appropriate as a prayer before action, and if the action consisted in doing a good turn for the enemy in place of dropping bombs upon him from an airplane, the action would be more in keeping with the prayer. Why tell God "I will fear no evil" if the next minute you order the U-Boat to submerge because an enemy ship has been sighted? True, you want to "get" the enemy ship, but you were also afraid the enemy ship would "get" you. Your "fear no evil" doctrine took a back seat. The very fact of joining the army or the navy in the first place is an evidence of either hypocrisy or fear, for if you "fear no evil because God is with me," then why resort to the weapons that He has condemned in order to protect yourself?

I am going to quote just one more prayer from this un-American document that the K.C. are circulating, and then I must discard it, otherwise I am liable to get arrested and put in jail. A very beautiful prayer for those at sea, on page 56, reads: "O God, Who didst bring our fathers through the Red Sea and carry them in safety through the overflowing waters, sing praises to Thy Holy Name, we humbly beseech Thee that Thou wouldst preserve Thy servants journeying by sea from all dangers, granting them a tranquil course and the wished for haven."

The foregoing indicates a faith that God is able to subdue the mountainous waves and conduct the ship safely into port. There is no way for us to help God to subdue the waves, He has to attend to the job alone. Still, we have a faith, and justly so, that, if it is His will, He will calm the tempest and save us or our friends or both from a watery grave. Now in the tempests of life, God has made provision that enables us to assist Him in the work of saving us from evil. If we do good in exchange for the enemy's evil, we are not only making an act of faith in God's promise that good will overcome evil, but we are also rendering a very practical aid. God's creatures – even those who disbelieve in Him – find it impossible to continue injuring us if we treat them with kindness and goodness in spite of their insults and their persecutions. God can and will save us on the ocean of life, if we

will not interfere with the working of His laws. The drunkard and the suicide whom Father Diekamp spoke of, and the soldier and sailor whom I am writing about, not only impede God's beneficence but actually make its expression impossible.

Consider the mothers of men. Do they rear children for the purpose of living a natural life or for the purpose of serving as cannon fodder? Here are two mothers, living in different countries. Their baby boys are about the same age. Each mother works hard to provide every comfort for the little tots. No sacrifice is too great. After years of struggle and self-denial; after enduring physical and mental agonies that the average man could not withstand; after watching sonny with tender care, shielding him from all harm, directing his footsteps in the war of righteousness; each of these mothers have brought each of the two boys safely through the stages of babyhood and youth and they are now young men with an average education purchased with the toil and tears of a devoted mother. Mother has left nothing undone in her struggle to procure for her boy the best that life contains. She would have done a hundred times more for him if it had been possible, for no pain of body or of mind, no matter how excruciating or distressful was too much to undergo on behalf of her boy. Here he is: the product of her noblest efforts. She has equipped him with the best education, with the manliest physique, the most superb character that it was possible for her endeavors to provide. She dreams -- and has a right to dream -- of how successful in life her boy will be, for he is an exceptional boy, every mother's boy is an exceptional boy. And then --

"The country is in danger" is the cry that quarreling diplomats send out. Either voluntarily or against their will, each of the boys whom we have considered in the foregoing illustration, starts for the battle front, they have nothing against each other, they have never known each other, and if a war did not come along it is likely they never would know and never would harm each other. Now they meet, and they pierce each other's heart with a bullet. Two young lives snuffed out, two promising careers shattered. Multiply this illustration by a few million and you have the story of war.

We are informed by the Red Cross that 9,819,000 were killed in the recent war; that 5,301,000 died as the result of economic blockades and war epidemics. All because man insists on interposing the designs of Almighty God. And, it would not be nearly so bad if those who make war suffered from it. They will pay some day, but while the slaughter goes on on earth, it is only the so-called common clay that is blessed with the honor of feeling the sting of battle. Those who make war stay at home and praise the fighters; incidentally the "stay at homes" have a few more millions added to their bloody loot.

Having given us free will, God cannot stop war. He gives us our choice of going to heaven or to hell, and if we insist upon going to hell there is not anybody but ourselves to

blame. The profiteers must bear their own burden of retribution, but we cannot shift any of our blame on to them. They will have enough to carry without taking part of our load.

Some of my resolutions are like a railroad timetable -- subject to change without notice. I said that I was not going to quote anything more from that Knights of Columbus' prayer book; the Catholic prayer book that the Knights of Columbus distribute free of charge to soldiers and sailors. It is evident that what I say cannot be depended upon, for I want to call your attention to some of the prayers that appear on pages four and five:

"O Lord God Almighty, Who hast brought us to the beginning of this day, defend us in the same by Thy power, that we may not fall this day into any sin, but that all our thoughts, words and works may be directed to the fulfillment of Thy will."

Does it seem right to ask God to "defend us by His power" and then desert Him? If we are going to rely upon His power to defend us, why have an army and navy? And in what manner is God's will made manifest if not in the words of Jesus Christ as recorded in the New Testament? We ask God, according to the prayer just quoted, to grant "that all our thoughts, words and works may be directed to the fulfillment of His will." In other words, we ask Him to guide us according to the rules of life laid down by our divine Savior, some of which I have quoted. Only recently, I read the fifth chapter of St. Matthew to a soldier who had fought overseas -- a Catholic youth -- and then I asked him whether that doctrine was a pro-war or anti-war doctrine. He said: "It is anti-war." Yet, despite this anti-war doctrine of Christ's, this young man -- John W. Kelly is his name -- says that if the country called him today or tomorrow he would go to war. He said that if he were offered a million dollars to go down south and kill 30 or 40 men, he would not consider that the money amounted to as much as a half a day's pay; that he positively would not kill anybody no matter how much he were paid for killing them. "But," he concludes, "I will go to war and kill for a dollar a day." Not because he wants to kill, not because he is willing to kill, but "War" has something about it that seems justifiable to him. Nearly everybody recognizes the wrongfulness of individual killing. They excuse wholesale killing on the grounds of a "just war." Each side is engaged in a "just war." How can both sides be right? You could not prove to either side that it is wrong. According to scripture, both sides are wrong.

"Our Father, Who art in heaven." The Father of all. Those whom He loves we set out to slay. Because of His love for them and for us, He would save us from their wrong-doing and save them from being murdered by us, if when they attack us we would live the thought expressed on page five of the K.C. prayer book which reads: "Our help is in the name of the Lord, Who hath made heaven and earth." If He made heaven and earth, surely He is able to save us from harm.

We seem to be confident that God is able to save us from harm considered individually. But, when it comes to a national issue, we are certain that He is powerless and that we must defend ourselves. The fact is, it is just as easy for God to defend and to save a million or a hundred million persons as it is for Him to save one person. As a little child, the good Sisters taught me in the Catholic school that "nothing is hard or impossible to God." And I know from reason and the light of faith that the good Sisters told me the truth. Since "nothing is hard" for God, then everything is easy. It is an easy thing for Him to defend and to save one person; it is an easy thing for Him to defend and to save one hundred million or a billion persons. Yet, each nation feels unsafe without an army and navy. "If all the nations would disarm, then America should disarm," is the way so many Christians express it. "But," they add, "so long as other nations keep an army and a navy, that long will America have to keep them." In other words, unless America had an army and a navy, God would not be able to defend her. Too, so long as other nations are resorting to evil means for defense, that long must America resort to evil means. It would never do for America to run the risk of setting a good example, because -- other nations would surely copy us and profiteers would lose out.

Another prayer in the K.C. book reads: "Preserve us, O Lord, from all dangers of soul and body; and by the intercession of the glorious and blessed Mary, the ever Virgin Mother of God, of blessed Joseph, of the blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, of blessed (your patron saint) and of all the Saints, grant us health and peace."

Why ask God to "preserve us from all dangers of soul and body" if He cannot respond? Is not resort to militarism a plain declaration that God cannot preserve us from all dangers of body? War is one of the dangers of body, and if we have to use the army to save us from this danger, why try to fool God into believing that we are depending upon Him? Too, why ask for health and peace through the intercession of God's Mother and of the saints? You may reply that, just as we rely upon God for health, yet we must also depend upon human agencies such as medicine and the doctor; and, while relying upon God for peace, yet we must also depend upon human agencies such as the army and navy. Seems reasonable, I'll admit. But, let us examine the matter a little more minutely.

In the first place, God has not forbidden the taking of medicine for the purpose of restoring health. Secondly, the doctors who make a study of caring for the sick are engaged in conserving the human family, not in destroying it. God has not prohibited the conservation of life, but He has prohibited the taking of life, i.e. human life. So, both the medicine that we take and the doctor who administers it are human agencies used to maintain life. While, in the case of war, the medicine that

we administer -- bullets -- and the doctors who administer it -- soldiers -- are human agencies used to destroy life. And there is another phase of the medicine vs. war controversy: Most of the ills for which human beings take medicine, are the result of disobeying or violating nature's laws, i.e. God's laws. Live according to God's laws, and medicine will seldom be needed. I am not, however, making any argument on this point aside from proving that there is no conflict in depending upon the intercession of the saints for obtaining health and at the same time resorting to the use of human elements, providing that those human elements are conducive to the restoration of health. While, there is conflict in depending upon the intercession of the saints for obtaining peace and at the same time resorting to the use of human elements that destroy peace instead of cultivating it. "If the enemy does not want peace, then we must bring peace to the world by battering in with the iron fist and shining sword the doors of those who will not have peace," said the German Emperor on December 22, 1917. But his "iron fist and shining sword" did not bring peace to the Fatherland or to the world. All warring nations repeat the substance of the German Emperor's December speech over and over again, but, although everybody wants peace, it cannot be brought into the world in that manner.

You may point to the fact that doctors take part in war, that they make up the medical division, and that at least they are not guilty of murder. My answer is that the military machine is similar to a bodily organism, composed of organs with separate and distinct functions to perform, yet mutually dependent and essential to life. The medical branch of the service is merely a cog in the wheel of the army, and a very necessary cog, for if the army had no medical division it would be still harder to get cannon fodder, because the soldiers would say: "If we are not going to receive medical attention after the battle, we will not fight."

"May the Lord bless us and defend us from all evil," is another of the prayers in the K.C. book. You might feel bored by so many citations that contain essentially the same substance, but I want to show that the prayers approved by the Catholic hierarchy are in accord with the doctrine of Jesus, that they presuppose a reliance upon the power of God to save us from human ills. War is one of the ills to which the human family is heir; not because war is a necessary condition of life, but because man persists in error. If it were not for human ills, the Divine Doctor need not point the way to erring humanity. He came to show us how to avoid the pitfalls of our fallen nature, but we insist upon plunging into these pitfalls despite His warning, and, heedless of His sacrifices that exemplified His teachings, we go on in sin and sorrow and destruction. It is blasphemy to ask the Lord to "defend us from all evil" and then turn around and use instruments that He has condemned.

This reminds one of the contention that "everything

in this world is good." Granted. But, improper use turns a good thing into an instrument of evil. The lead or steel and the powder used in bullets are good, but, when a bullet is made and used for the purpose of killing a human being, the perversion results in evil. I referred to this matter some time back in quoting Father Hogan. But it has seemed propitious to repeat the argument at this time and to add a couple of illustrations. Notwithstanding what I have just said, you may still insist that "everything is good" and therefore that war is good. A friend of mine, John Fihelly, who served his country in the army while I served my country behind bars, was arguing this point with me only recently, and when I asked him if drunkenness was good, he replied: "Yes, because it serves as an example to others." If the example is a good one, others should emulate it. If it is bad, others should order their lives in a way to escape it. My good friend Fihelly will not contend that everybody should emulate the example of the drunkard, which is only another way of saying that the drunkard's example of drunkenness is not a good example. If it is not a good example, it must be a bad example, for the opposite of good is bad. In the last analysis, however, I will admit that there is no such a thing as evil in the world, for everything is really good, and what we speak of as evil is only a lesser degree of good. But it is convenient to describe as evil those things that we readily recognize are not good. Hence St. Paul's exhortation to "overcome evil with good." Is stealing good? Is suicide good? Is homicide good? Friend Fihelly will claim that they possess good qualities in that they serve as examples. Well, war serves as an example. And war is the same kind of an example as homicide, i.e., it teaches us what we should avoid doing by setting before our eyes and our minds what an abominable, Satanic undertaking it is. Christ knew that many would go to war despite His pleas; hence His prophecy "there shall be wars and rumors of wars," but he also warned us how sinful it is to participate in war.

Another prayer in the K.C. prayer book reads: "Save thy servants, trusting in Thee, O God. Give us peace in Thy strength." Translated into the language expressed in the actions of the Knights of Columbus, this passage means: "Give us peace in Thy strength, O Lord; but in case You are lacking in strength, give us peace in the strength of General Pershing and Marshal Foch whose battalions of anti-nonresistance we will faithfully serve."

At a joint session of Congress, on May 27, 1918, President Wilson said, in speaking of man and money with which to prosecute the war: "The volume of our might must steadily and rapidly be augmented until there can be no question of resisting it." How different are the words of Christ: "You have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; but I say to you not to resist evil, if one strike thee on the right cheek turn to him also the other." Whose policy should we adopt, Wilson's or Christ's? Both, I am willing to

admit, spoke in the interests of humanity. None -- at least not any Christians -- will deny that Christ spoke in the interests of humanity when he urged the doctrine of resist not evil. I will not question President Wilson's sincerity, and will therefore admit that he believed that he spoke in the interests of humanity when He urged the doctrine of "augmenting the volume of might until it could not be resisted." The only difference between these two advocates is that Christ spoke with divine wisdom, while Wilson uttered the finite fallacy of humankind. Christ urged that we follow the opinion of His heavenly Father, while Wilson urged that we follow the opinion of blind leaders of the blind.

In the second chapter of St. Luke, we learn the story of the shepherds keeping the night watches over their flock in the early hours of the first Christmas morn. "And behold an angel of the Lord stood by them, and the brightness of God shone round about them; and they feared with a great fear. And the angel said to them: Fear not; for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, that shall be to all the people: For, this day, is born to you a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord, in the city of David ... And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly army, praising God and saying: Glory to God in the highest; and on earth peace to men of good will." Here we have the recipe for peace. Here we learn from God's angelic messengers just how peace may be secured on earth. "Peace to men of good will." In many non-Catholic Bibles, this text is changed to read: "Peace on earth, good will toward men." There is considerable difference between the two statements, if analyzed closely. Since however, I am using the Catholic Bible, I will use the text taken from the original manuscripts, viz: "Peace on earth to men of good will."

Webster's dictionary defines good will thusly: "Benevolence; kindly feeling; that which possesses desirable qualities, promotes welfare or happiness, is kind, etc.; advancement of interest or happiness. Opposite to evil, harm, etc." War is not benevolent, nor does it possess any desirable qualities. Primarily it does not promote welfare nor happiness, although the warlords claim that war is waged for the purpose of ultimately securing people's welfare and providing them with happiness. There is not a war in the history of the world that ever resulted in welfare and happiness ultimately. Warlords will tell us that this is the fault of history and not the fault of war. But the fact is that good begets good, while evil begets evil. Christ put it better when He said that an evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit. There are so few who will contend that war is a manifestation of good will that it hardly seems worth while to waste time proving that the contrary is true. It may be well, however, to answer the argument that, in going to war on behalf of the innocent who are oppressed and cannot defend themselves, one is expressing good will for his fellow man who is

suffering and in need. The answer is contained in my reply to Father Macksey that covered this specific point quite fully. No matter how worthy the end, an evil means is not justified nor will it in the last analysis be of any avail.

Take, for instance, the work done by the Knights of Columbus during the war. Surely their welfare work is unassailable! I for one cannot find words to adequately express my approbation. It is not necessary, however, for a slacker to attempt to sing the praises of the Knights of Columbus, because the good that they have done, the cheer that they brought to lonely hearts, the comfort and solace that they instilled into the minds of hundreds of thousands who would otherwise have suffered indescribably from the sad, disconsolate, torture-filled life of the soldier in battle, the innumerable acts of kindness, the spiritual and material help rendered those in distress, and the myriad other manifestations of good will, will ever remain as a monument to the Knights of Columbus. And this monument is erected in the heart of every soldier lad, in the hearts of his loved ones too. The same may be said of all those organizations that undertook welfare work on behalf of the soldiers, but I am not aware of which organization did the most, nor does it matter with regard to the point that I am trying to make. Regardless of how little or how much each of the welfare organizations did, all were working for the welfare of the soldier lads. I am confining myself to the Knights of Columbus, because a little criticism will follow, and, as a Catholic, I must observe the maxim that charity begins at home.

Yes, the K.C. did good work. But, at the same time, the "higher-ups" and the "lower-downs" and all through the ranks, every kind of a K.C. was boosting for the war. Not all of them supported the war, for some of them were in prison with the writer, but so few opposed the war that it can be said, so far as practical purposes are concerned, that the Knights of Columbus supported the war. Unfortunately, the evil that they did, discounted all the good performed in their welfare work. On the whole, the aggregate of their activities may be likened to a robber and a murderer who enters a home occupied by a family of ten persons. He kills some members of the family, injures others, robs all of them, but, to assuage a portion of the grief for which he is responsible, he consoles those not killed with words of kindness and by restoring part of the stolen goods. The K.C. have indirectly been the cause of killing a large number of members in the human family, injuring many thousands of others, and robbing all of them. They did not "pick our pockets," but paying for the war is even harder on the average citizen than a pickpocket would be.

In extenuation of their conduct, it must be said of the Knights of Columbus that most of them -- perhaps all -- thought that they were doing the right thing. The same is true of all Christians. But the mystery of the whole situation lies in the

fact that Christ so unmistakably condemned everything that savors of war, and yet Christians are the principal gamesters in this barbarous affair. Those not of the faith, but who have read the Bible and therefore know what Christianity teaches, cannot understand our actions. On the other hand, Christians cannot understand why the heathen fails to understand the sublimity of wholesale slaughter. We send missionaries to the heathen, but the so-called heathen know something of modern warfare and they shake their heads in righteous disgust.

"Then came Peter unto him and said: Lord, how often shall my brother offend against me, and I forgive him? till seven times? Jesus saith to him, I say not to thee, till seven times; but till seventy times seven times." -- Matt. 18:21. We use the "seventy times seven times" rule of Christ's in war, only we punish seventy times seven times for the purpose of "future security" as Father Macksey called it. In fact, we punished the Germans considerably more than seventy times seven times, but "future security" necessitated such action, and, moreover, it was done in the interests of the German people, to save them from future wars, etc. I am not condemning the amount of the indemnity, because, after all, if it were a million times what was levied upon the German people, it would not pay for the cost of one American life lost. What I was calling attention to was that, there is a slight dissimilarity between Christ's rule of forgiveness and the Christian's rule of "future security."

In Matthew 21:19 we are told of the fig tree withering away instantly at the command of Christ. His disciples wondered and asked how this happened. And Jesus told them: "If you shall have faith, and stagger not, not only this of the fig tree shall you do, but also if you shall say to this mountain, take up and cast thyself into the sea, it shall be done. And all things whatsoever you shall ask in prayer, believing, you shall receive." Faith and prayer will overcome life's most insuperable obstacles.

Have you ever thought of the faith manifested by the non-Christian workingmen in their cause? So strong is this faith that they refuse to go to war, knowing as they do that wars are fought in the interest of those who oppress the workers. Not all of the workingmen are loyal to their convictions, but I was blessed by association with many hundreds in prison who were loyal. Realizing that a workingman has nothing to gain by slaughtering a workingman at the behest of the profiteers, the workers of whom I have spoken chose torture and imprisonment in preference to the ease and renown that comfortable positions in the army would have afforded them. I will have something to say, before concluding, concerning these men, but just now I want to observe that if Christians would have the same faith in their God that the non-Christians have in a mere materialistic ideal, "Thy Kingdom Come" would shortly be a reality in this world of sorrow and travail.

In the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, we are told of facts that are not at all comforting to the worldly-minded. For the Christian, however, the words have no terror, for he knows that God will comfort and sustain him in all the tribulations through which he must pass, and it is the Christian's privilege to give testimony. We read: "And you shall hear of wars and rumors of wars. See that ye be not troubled. For these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; and there shall be pestilences, and famines, and earthquakes in places: Now all these are the beginnings of sorrows. Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall put you to death: and you shall be hated by all nations for my name's sake. And then shall many be scandalized: and shall betray one another: and shall hate one another. And many false prophets shall rise, and shall seduce many. And because iniquity hath abounded, the charity of many shall grow cold. But he that shall persevere to the end, he shall be saved. And this gospel of the kingdom, shall be preached in the whole world, for a testimony to all nations, and then shall the consummation come."

Christ's reference to "the consummation" brings to mind that we know not when the end will come. We must be prepared. The best preparation is to live righteously. Certain signs will manifest themselves, and Catholic theologians have indicated the following as the nine principal signs that are to forecast the end of the world: 1. General preaching of the Christian religion; 2. Conversion of the Jews; 3. Return of Henoch and Elias; 4. A great apostasy; 5. The reign of Antichrist; 6. Extraordinary perturbations of nature; 7. The universal conflagration; 8. The trumpet of the resurrection; 9. The sign of the Son of Man appearing in the heavens. But we must not be attempting to discern whether any of these signs are manifesting themselves; not that there is any harm in doing so, but it is a waste of valuable time. We must concentrate our attention upon what I have recently quoted in the preceding paragraph. After warning us that we shall hear of wars and rumors of wars, and of nation raising against nation, Christ makes it clear that He does not wish that we should take part in these wars, for he pleads; "See that ye be not troubled. For these things must come to pass." Just as he previously said that "it must needs be that scandals come; but nevertheless, woe to that man by whom the scandal cometh."

After relating the many miseries that would befall humankind, of pestilence and famine, of earthquakes and afflictions, of scandals and betrayals, of hatred and seductions, of abounding iniquity and charity grown cold, the good Master assures us: "But he that shall persevere to the end, he shall be saved."

Just as He calmed the waters on the treacherous sea and saved the lives of His disciples as we learn in the eighth chapter of Matthew, so will He quell the treachery that

storms about the Christian on the sea of life. Since many will ignore God's laws and war against one another, since many will scandalize regardless of God's warning, what a privilege to be a Christian, to separate oneself from the wickedness of the world and to avoid the penalty that will inevitably accompany it. Why this life is a life of sorrow, I have often wondered. It seems that no matter what Adam and Eve did, no matter what those who came before me did, I should not have to suffer except on account of my own wrong-doing. Reasoned from my finite viewpoint, it seems like a great injustice that I should be punished because of others' sins. Why not let me come into the world, fight my own battles, pay my own penalties? That will be punishment enough! And what I say of myself, I say of others. It is a mystery to me why there should be so much suffering in the world, suffering which, to my mind, is needless. But I do not know what God knows; if I did, I would be a God myself. If you and I were given the light of complete understanding, we know that the order of things would then appear different to us than that which now perplexes and makes us sad. So, the sensible thing to do -- aside from its being the religiously proper thing -- is to take the world just as we find it, believe that God has arranged all for our greater good, and from this promise proceed to adjust our lives with our environment as best we can.

We face two propositions: First, we may follow our own inclinations, or we may adopt a rule of life that will contain a mixture of what Christ taught and what we think is right. Secondly, we may follow the rules of the game that were laid down by Christ, and, where our own personal views conflict with the Master's proposals, it will then be advisable to discard our own ideas and substitute Christ's in their entirety. In other words: We will be with Christ or against Him.

This being a world of sorrow, we cannot escape affliction no matter what course we pursue. If we play the game of life contrary to God's rules, we are going to suffer. If we play the game according to God's rules, we are going to suffer. There is, however, a difference. Without God we will suffer the maximum; with God we will suffer the minimum and in addition we will be making good-sized daily deposits in the bank of eternity. "My yoke is sweet and My burden is light."

Since, by taking a certain road we will encounter less displeasure than upon the other road, and, since we have reached that point on the highway of life where it becomes necessary for us to choose which road we are going to travel, the practical thing to do is to follow that route designated by our divine Lord as the "straight and narrow path." Not only will it be more delightful to journey upon this path, but when we reach the end of our trip we will be greeted by that blessed welcome: "Well done, good and faithful servant: because thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will place thee over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." -- Matt. 25:23.

You will remember that in Father Macksey's treatise on war, he often referred to the Natural Law. At the time that I was answering his argument, I remarked that I did not know for certain what he meant by the term "natural law," but that I would assume that he meant the law of God. Since then, after a great deal of effort and delay, I have been able to procure the Catholic Encyclopedia that contains an article on Natural Law written by Father James J. Fox, S.T.D., Professor of Philosophy, St. Thomas' College, Washington. It will be profitable at this time to consider this treatise on the Natural Law with regard to its bearing upon the issue of war, for it will afford still more proof of the fact that war conflicts with Christianity, and, since there is conflict, it is obvious that we should have nothing to do with war or preparation for war, in order that we may live as Christians and thus live a happier and more successful life upon earth as well as making adequate preparation for the "future security" of our eternal life.

Says Father Fox: "According to St. Thomas, the natural law is 'nothing else than the rational creature's participation in the eternal law.'" In other words, what Christ taught is the natural law, for His teachings were merely an expression of the eternal law. By "His teachings" I mean that portion of His utterances wherein He provided certain rules by which we should live.

Again quoting from Father Fox: "The rule, then, which God has prescribed for our conduct, is found in our nature itself. Those actions which conform with its tendencies, lead to our destined end, and are thereby constituted right and morally good; those at variance with our nature are wrong and immoral."

The "tendency" of our nature is to live on until we die a natural death. The "tendency" of war is to kill millions prematurely and unnaturally. Therefore, these opposing tendencies are manifestly conflicting actions, and, since the former is found in our nature itself, it is, according to Father Fox, the rule which God has prescribed for our conduct. And, since the latter is at variance with our nature, it is, according to Father Fox, wrong and immoral. Bear in mind, I am not now considering whether war is "just" or "unjust." I am only taking into consideration what war really is. Of course, I claim that all wars are "unjust" notwithstanding the fact that each side to every conflict that was ever waged or ever will be waged claims that its participation in the war is "just"; but I mentioned that I am not considering the justification or lack of justification of war, in order that I can confine this particular phase of the argument to the question of what the effect of war is. To repeat: war is an action at variance with the tendency of our nature, and therefore, according to Father Fox's statement quoted in the preceding paragraph, it is wrong and immoral.

Father Fox may counter something like this: Sickness is also at variance with our nature, but it is not wrong or immoral.

The answer is: If you and I were to engage in an undertaking that would result in forcing sickness upon millions of persons, and those persons died from the sickness, we would be guilty of murder. Such is the game of war. We join the army for the purpose of forcing certain kinds of injuries upon our fellow men that result in death. You will say that we are defending ourselves from their attack. Well, all wars are defensive wars. Military commanders the world over tell us that offensive movements are necessary for defensive purposes. The Allies were fighting a defensive war, so were the Central Powers, but each side claimed that it was necessary in their "just" war to assume the offensive defensively. This very day, Russia and Poland are fighting a defensive war, yet each side is justifying itself in the use of offensive maneuvers.

The next quotation from Father Fox's "Natural Law" bearing upon this subject is: "We enunciate, for instance, one of the leading precepts in the words: 'Thou shalt not kill'; yet the taking of human life is sometimes a lawful, and even an obligatory act. Herein exists no variation in the law; what the law forbids is not all taking of life, but all unjust taking of life."

Answer: It seems to me that it would be just as reasonable to say that the command "Thou shalt not steal" does not forbid all stealing but only unjust stealing. Or, that the command "Thou shalt not commit adultery" does not forbid all adultery but only unjust adultery. If a distinction were to be made between "just" and "unjust" killing, why did God fail to include the proviso? It was a blunder to omit such an important provision, for, nearly all those who have killed their fellow men believe that the action was just, that the murdered deserved to be killed. This is especially true in the case of war. The Germans did not believe that their war was an "unjust taking of life," because they were fighting to protect the Fatherland from those who lusted its downfall. And the Allies did not believe that their war was an "unjust taking of life," because they were fighting to protect civilization from destruction at the hands of the "Huns." Since neither side was engaged in the "unjust taking of life," neither side was answerable to God for violation of the command to not kill, according to Father Fox. Yet, his view is partially disputed by a priest writing for The Nation of March 6, 1920, whose article, appearing on pages 296 and 297, read in part: "Looking at the World War as moralists, the clergy everywhere knew that at least one of the participants must be waging an unjust war, and that as a consequence murder was being done every day on all the fronts. Though they all loudly proclaimed the righteousness of their own people, every one of them knew that for all he had learned God held the enemy in high esteem, perhaps looked on them as His favored children." Who is to decide which side is right? If left to man, both sides would continue to the end of time claiming to be right. Only God knows which has the greater amount of justification to its credit. But, to avoid the possibility of error, since He was not going to communicate with us personally concerning the matter, the All Wise One settled the question by making a blanket law without any exceptions or reservations which read THOU SHALT NOT KILL.

Christ tells us in Matthew 10:28: "And fear ye not them that kill the body, and are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him that can destroy both soul and body in hell." An invading army can kill our bodies, in case God should will that our resolve to overcome evil with good should not avail in the event that we tried God's plan; but the army could not kill our souls. While, when we go forth to battle with weapons that God has condemned, we not only have our bodies killed, but also, by consenting to take part in war, we make it possible for the warlords to "kill the soul and destroy both soul and body in hell." The night before His crucifixion, our divine Lord sealed the fate of those who take part in war when He rebuked Peter with the words that we find in Matthew 26:52: "Put up again thy sword into its place: for all that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

Today, we find the scene that preceded Christ's death reenacted. When He began to become unpopular, His prophecy that all would be scandalized in Him came true. One denied Him, another betrayed Him, nearly all of the disciples fled. And so it is today in the question of wholesale murder. Christian ministers and priests are betraying Him into the hands of the profiteers; others not quite so brazen are denying Him; still others are fleeing in fear and trembling because of the government's secret service and the unfavorable publicity by newspapers and the hysteria of the mob; how few, how very few of God's ambassadors occupied the only pulpit that a Christian minister can honestly occupy in time of war -- a prison cell!

There is a passage in St. Luke 22:36 to 38 that might puzzle one who is inclined to see the inharmony of war with the attitude of a Christian. It reads: "Then He said unto them: But now he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise a scrip: and he that hath not, let him sell his coat, and buy a sword ... But they said: Lord, behold here are two swords. And He said to them, It is enough." This incident took place not long before the scene in the garden when Christ reproved Peter for using the sword. It appears that Christ told his disciples to "buy a sword" for the purpose of making certain that the sword would be on hand when the proper time for Him to condemn its use arrived. It was not necessary for Christ to trouble Himself thusly, any more than He needed to go through certain preliminaries before restoring sight to the blind man, but the fact is He told His disciples to buy a sword, and later He uttered that solemn warning that those who used the sword would perish with it, so, it is evident that He did not tell the disciples to buy a sword for the purpose of sanctioning its use.

Again quoting Father Fox on the Natural Law: "Self-preservation is right, but to refuse to expose our life when the well-being of society requires it, is wrong. It is wrong to drink to intoxication, for, besides being injurious to health, such indulgence deprives one of the use of reason, which is intended by God to be the guide and dictator of conduct."

Answer: You will remember that a certain priest

in argument with my brother, contended that "self-preservation is the first law of nature." Father Fox agrees with this priest up to a certain point, after which he claims in essence that self-preservation is wrong. In other words, self-preservation is right up to a certain point, then it turns into a wrong; just as killing is wrong up to a certain point, then it turns into a right; such is the logic of those whom I am quoting. The priest who contended with my brother John claimed that since self-preservation is the first law of nature, we should defend ourselves against attack. Father Fox shows this priest that such so-called defense is not self-preservation, for, to quote his words, "to refuse to expose our life when the well-being of society requires it, is wrong." This exposure of one's life is more in the nature of inviting destruction rather than preserving according to the evidence that one may read on millions of little wooden crosses at the places dedicated to those who died, as many of them at the time believed, for the "well-being of society." The kind of self-preservation advocated by the conscientious objector -- I am now writing of the religious C.O. -- would preserve without exposing ourselves or our enemies.

Father Fox says that drinking to intoxication is wrong, for it injures our health and deprives us of the use of reason, "which is intended by God to be the guide and dictator of conduct." That was the idea I had about reason, but when I acted according to it, the Knights of Columbus expelled me from their organization, and Catholics in general and priests in particular -- negatively if not positively -- supported and approved my imprisonment. If Father Fox was opposed to the imprisonment of C.O.s, I have not heard of any vigorous activity on his part to cause our release. He may be dead, for all I know. One thing certain, he is dead so far as this issue is concerned, for we have not heard from him. On the other hand, if Father Fox was with the mob in sanctioning the persecution of those who used their reason as a "guide and dictator of conduct," then he tacitly contradicted his own argument.

Father Fox has an alibi though. He will claim that it was not the use of reason that landed C.O.s in prison, but their failure to use reason. And, in cases where an honest attempt was made by a C.O. to use reason, his "judgment was defective." So, I must ask Father Fox to consider, not only the testimony already introduced but also that that will yet be offered in proof of the claim that militarism is the enemy of Christianity.

It will be well, however, to dispose of three analogies before going farther. I previously mentioned something about "unjust stealing", "unjust adultery," and now I will deal with "unjust intoxication" in addition to completing the two previous analogies. There is no commandment against intoxication, no direct command like in the case of killing, stealing, adultery, but for purposes of demonstrating similarities, and to show that one could just as reasonably argue in favor of "just stealing" etc., I will consider in their sequence: stealing, adultery, and intoxication.

War is defended on the ground that it is not "unjust killing." To quote Father Fox: "what the law forbids, is not all taking of life, but all unjust taking of life." This refers not only to war, but also to capital punishment and to individual self-defense.

If the wage earners of this nation had the power to despoil every monopolist of his wealth and to appropriate the same for their own benefit, -- for the wage earners' own benefit -- such a move would transfer billions of dollars from one ownership to another. I have not made this quite clear, for, as a matter of fact, the workers have such power. What I intended to suppose was: if the workers would tomorrow morning, through their representatives, call upon the official spokesmen of the Catholic Church in America, and say: "We are ready to act; we can by one peaceful move, dispossess every monopolist in this nation of the wealth that he now has; we wish to do this for the purpose of defending ourselves against continued exploitation, for the purpose of securing at least a part of what has been stolen from us, and for the purpose of safeguarding our future security against possible violation. Now, reverend Fathers, we want to know before making this move: will it be morally right?"

I can imagine the clergy pointing to the fact that such a move would be like unto stealing the money of those who now possess it, and therefore a violation of the command "Thou shalt not steal." The workers would reply that the command to not steal does not forbid all stealing but only unjust stealing; that, while in a sense their proposal could be considered in the category of stealing, yet, it was "just stealing" because through years of legalized theft their earnings had been diverted into the pockets of the monopolist; that government statistics show that the workers receive only 16% of the product of their labor while they are entitled to the full product of their labor, making allowances of course for what justly belongs to capital, which would give labor about 95% or more of what labor produces. The workers would show, that, according to Father Fox, the command to not kill prohibits only unjust killing; and, since wholesale killing is justified on the grounds of defense, necessary punishment and the need of future security, so should wholesale stealing be justified upon the same grounds. Do you think that the writers of the Catholic Encyclopedia would write long articles in defense of the workers' suggestion that I have just outlined, or would Catholic books and newspapers and magazines be filled with protests against the inane proposals of the nation's workers to violate the command "Thou shalt not steal"?

There is more justification for the workers banding together and despoiling the monopolists -- although I do not advise nor would I approve such a move -- than there is for people banding together and using firearms to repel invaders. The reason that I do not advise and would not approve a move on the part of the workers, such as the one outlined in the illustration, is because I believe there is a better, more Christian method of solving this problem of

exploitation. In the case of an invading army, the invaders can be overcome without bullets, as was done by the Russians at Brest-Litovsk¹⁷. Moreover, even though the invaders did conquer your territory and subject the victims to the domination of the conquerors, the wage-earners in this country could not be any worse off than they now are, for the most tyrannical of tyrants will permit his slaves to live and to reproduce, for if he did not do so, he would soon be without slaves. The wage earners of America today are barely living; in fact, not all are barely living, many are dying from actual starvation; the starvation is slow, but it is starvation nevertheless. The invading army is mostly made up of workingmen and they can be educated to the point of rebelling with the conquered workingmen against the common enemy.

In the case of those who war upon American citizens by and with the power of entrenched capital, the workers have a much greater right to oppose violence with violence, because industrial wars kill more workingmen and more families of workingmen than wars between nations. The monopolists can thank the military authorities at Fort Douglas for my present inability to quote statistics in proof of the assertion just made; although it is more than four weeks since I was sent from the Utah prison to the Washington insane asylum, my personal belongings are still in Utah; I assume that they are in Utah, for they have not yet arrived in Washington, D.C. If you do not already know, however, how much more deadly and destructive industrial wars are, you can readily get the data in any one of numerous documents. By "industrial wars" I mean not only those instances of killing strikers and their families, but the more insidious process of daily grinding the bodies of men, women, and little children into enormous profits for those whose principal labor in life consists in yachting, golfing, and subsidizing colleges for the miseducation of youth. While I have asserted that the workers have a greater right to oppose violence with violence in the instances just cited, I do not mean by that to condone the use of violence. But if killing in a "just war" is moral, then stealing in a "just war" upon the monopolists would be moral.

Now reverse the proposition. Stealing is actually going on every day. The former are not sticking a gun into the face of the latter and commanding a shelling-out, but they are plying their trade with greater efficiency and more lucratively. In a single instance -- the case of land monopoly -- the producers of this country are being robbed of six billion dollars annually. The great financiers of the nation are stealing every day from those who buy life's necessities. And, if they cannot steal as much as they desire, they create artificial scarcity. Less than three weeks ago, eighty carloads of potatoes were dumped into the Delaware River near Wilmington, Delaware, because potatoes were too plentiful to permit of proper market manipulation. A few days after these 80 carloads of potatoes were dumped into the river, an advertisement "Child for sale" appeared in an Oak Park, Ill. weekly paper. "High cost of living makes sale necessary," said the ad, after reciting that the baby was of legitimate parentage, four years old, a beautiful girl, blue eyes, excellent health, etc.

I remember another instance of a mother killing herself and four children, several months ago, because the cost of living was so high. No excuse for suicide, but I am only stating what happened. The 100% Americans at Fort Douglas have that newspaper clipping, so I cannot give you the name of the family and the city. Hardly necessary though, for you know of cases all around you where people are being driven to desperation because of the high cost of living. The condition that provides those who toil not with an income of millions annually while making life unbearable for those who toil nearly every day in the year is one of legalized theft. This theft is certainly a mortal sin, because it is driving some insane, killing others, and impoverishing everybody. Still, the clergy seem to not deny the sacraments to the robbers until the stolen money has been returned to its rightful owners. It seems to be a case of where the stealing is "just stealing" and therefore not immoral. A man driven to suicide because of economic oppression, is denied a church burial in the Catholic Church; not because of his reason for suicide but because he is a suicide. On the other hand, a man who becomes a multi-millionaire through "business" methods is not only given a church burial but all the prominent priests for miles around attend the funeral and the bishop reads the Mass.

I do not condemn the rich, nor do I condemn the clergy. I am simply stating a simple fact in a simple manner. Because the man-made laws of the land make it legal to despoil the worker of his earnings, the theft is -- tacitly at least -- looked upon as "just stealing," regardless of the command to not steal. Because the man-made laws of the land make it legal and compulsory to kill working people in the game of war, the killing is looked upon as "just killing." True, rich people are killed in war as well as poor people; but whenever that happens it is usually the result of a mistake or because some exception to the rule insisted on getting into the danger zone, for, as a rule, the sons of rich men are officers high in command of the army and they are so essential to the success of the war that they are kept in safety-first places.

The remedy for all this is not bitterness, not revenge, not killing, not stealing. Christian charity, a Christian life, the practicing and preaching of Christianity will cure every ill to which man is heir. I have no right to condemn a rich man for his oppression of the poor, for if I were rich I might be a greater oppressor, especially if I were living in darkness. Even without being rich, my faults and shortcomings are perhaps greater and more offensive to God than those who I would condemn. What I write is not for purposes of condemnation but for purposes of enlightenment. I believe that every person wants to do what is right, and only what is right. Even an insane person wants to do what is right. If one does wrong, it is usually through ignorance, seldom if ever through inherent badness.

Now, concerning adultery. I mentioned that it was just as sensible to refer to "unjust adultery" as to refer to "unjust killing." Since God prohibited both, without reservation,

unconditionally, then there is no such a thing as "just killing" any more than there would be "just adultery." Adultery is not overcome by adultery, nor is killing overcome by killing. Of course in war there is a group element, while in adultery it is an individual matter. But man came before the State, and if you justify killing in groups of men since the State has been organized, then you could just as logically justify adultery if committed in the name of the State. In fact adultery was at one time justified in the name of the State. In order to put a stop to what the Mormons considered "just adultery" -- although they did not use that term -- the American government established a little killing station which of course would indulge only in "just killing" and set this station on a hill overlooking the hotbed of Mormonism and within easy range of its Temple, and this killing station was called Fort Douglas, Utah. "Just killing" seemed the greater of two evils to the Mormons, so they abolished what they in essence considered "just adultery" although I do not know whether any Mormons used that term. I said that adultery was at one time justified in the name of the State, and while it is true that the Mormons permitted polygamy without requiring any allegiance to the State, and justified it without reference to the State, yet the civil institutions established by them in defense of polygamy are cases in point.

With regard to intoxication, Father Fox says that it is wrong to drink to this excess, because it ruins the health and deprives one of the use of reason. But, following the "just killing" line of reasoning in certain respects, a drunkard could justify what he would, under certain circumstances, style "just intoxication." He was despondent, and growing more despondent every hour; if he kept on he might lose his mind and kill himself, perhaps kill others; so he took to drinking heavily in order to drown his troubles. He believes that the intoxication was justified under the circumstances, for there was no other way to solve the problem. His mistake is quite evident -- there was another and a better way to solve the problem. And so it is in war, for war is not the last resort, there is another and a better way to handle the situation.

Again quoting Father Fox on the Natural Law: "The exposition of St. Thomas is at once the most simple and philosophic. Starting from the promise that good is what primarily falls under the apprehension of the practical reason -- that is of reason acting as the dictator of conduct -- and that, consequently, the supreme principle of moral action must have the good as its central idea, he holds that the supreme principle, from which all the other principles and precepts are derived, is that good is to be done, and evil avoided."

Answer: Since, according to St. Thomas, the supreme principle is that good is to be done and evil avoided, there seems little use of arguing the question of war, for to attempt overcoming the evil of war with the evil of war would be a deviation from the supreme principle of doing good and avoiding evil. War will not overcome war, and to try to overcome evil in this manner would be like an effort to overcome stealing with stealing, adultery with adultery, and intoxication with intoxication. St. Thomas' statement is

essentially the same as that of St. Paul, viz; overcome evil with good.

The final quotation on the Natural Law that I wish to cite from the work of Father Fox, reads: "As the fundamental and all-embracing obligation imposed upon man by the Creator, the natural law is the one to which all his other obligations are attached. The duties imposed on us in the supernatural law come home to us, because the natural law and its exponent, conscience, tell us that, if God has vouchsafed to us a supernatural revelation with a series of precepts, we are bound to accept and obey it. The natural law is the foundation of all human law inasmuch as it ordains that man shall live in society, and society for its constitution requires the existence of an authority, which shall possess the moral power necessary to control the members and direct them to the common good. Human laws are valid and equitable only in so far as they correspond with, and enforce or supplement the natural law; they are null and void when they conflict with it."

Answer: The foregoing makes it clear that human laws are null and void when they conflict with God's laws. Just what the human law regarding war does! Father Fox says: "The natural law and its exponent, conscience, tell us that ... we are bound to obey it" -- i.e. obey Christ's precepts and God's commandments. Father also says: "The natural law ... requires the existence of an authority, which shall possess the moral power necessary to control the members and direct them to the common good." All history proves that the common good is not to be found in war. We did not need to wade through the blood of centuries to learn this. Christ made it clear when He said that an evil tree could not bring forth good fruit.

To a certain extent, the error of justifying war is linked with the error of justifying what is generally called capital punishment. "Capital punishment" means, in this instance, the killing of a human being by the State in punishment for a crime or crimes committed. If Christians could understand the inherent wrongfulness of capital punishment, it would help them to see the sin of warfare. So, before going farther in citing the authority of Christ in opposition to war, I will first handle the question of capital punishment, and then homicide, after which it will be helpful to show how all three subjects are interrelated, and then I will introduce the final evidence in this case of Christianity vs. war.

It happens that I have access to certain papers, entitled Thesis LCII of Theses in Ethics, and these papers contain the preparatory material for examination leading to the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Boston College, conducted by the Jesuits. Perhaps I should not quote from these papers; yet, I can see no harm in doing so, for what I will quote is merely the Jesuits' defense of capital punishment. I will number each line so that I may afterwards refer to the particular section that I will then be answering.

Although it will consume a few extra pages by quoting in full what Boston College has stated in its examination papers on the question of capital punishment, still, as in the case of Father Macksey's argument on war, it will be fairer to present the argument just as Boston College has presented it without interposing my arguments. The Thesis affirms that "Civil Authority possesses the Right of Capital Punishment" and reads as follows:

1 "Thesis deals with a special phase of judicial
2 authority in criminal cases, and maintains that the State
3 possesses the right of capital punishment; it does not treat
4 of its exercise. The former flows from the very nature of
5 civil society and is inalienable. The latter is a matter of
6 prudence, and depends upon varying circumstances.

7 2. On the natural end, which justifies the
8 infliction of penalty in general, and the death penalty in
9 particular, there are many false views, though no one denies to
10 the State the penal power;

11 (a) Kant denies that penalty has any end; it
12 is merely the necessary consequence of crime; -- a false
13 view, for it makes penalty itself an end, which it cannot be,
14 as an evil; but it is always permitted as accompanying a
15 good end, or a means to a good end.

16 (b) Others justify the penalty by the original
17 compact, or by the implicit consent of the culprit, when
18 offending, to submit to penalty; -- a false view, for the
19 judicial right of punishing is from nature, as civil author-
20 ity itself is, and not from a free pact.

21 (c) Others place the end in the correction of
22 the offender, and today many base this view on the theory,
23 that crime is a physical evil, not moral, and due to man's
24 disordered nature or irresistible social condition; -- a
25 false view, because correction is a secondary end, as we
26 shall see; and the latter form of this theory denies free
27 will; in general we contend, that civil authority in inflict-
28 ing penalty must have for its end the common good, and so it
29 often must impose penalty, even if there is no hope of
30 correcting.

31 (d) Others say, the end is to dissuade or to
32 deter from crime; a false view, because it denies the
33 corrective purpose of penalty altogether; and then penalty
34 may have to be inflicted to prevent a criminal from being
35 physically able to commit crime, not merely to dissuade.

36 (e) Others say, the end is the State's self-
37 defence; a false view, because crimes have to be punished
38 after commission; but this is no case of self-defence; but
39 if self-defence is taken in the broad sense, to mean the
40 conservation and the safe-guarding of the common good, this
41 opinion is true, but the phrase is ambiguous.

42 (f) Others say, the end is the reparation of
43 the violated order of justice; a false view, for although all
44 penalty is such a reparation, and if God inflict the penalty

43 such reparation is its end, still in the case of penalty
44 inflicted by civil authority this view is false, for such
45 reparation can be the end only in so far as it is necessary
46 for the common good; for we must hold fast to the principle
47 that the State has no power except in the measure that the
48 end of the State demands, i.e., the common good.

49 (g) The true opinion holds that justification
50 of penalty imposed flows from the justification of it when
51 threatened, and so depends on the general question of the
52 justice of sanction, for this is what penalty is. Now the
53 end of Sanction is: (a) as threatened, beforehand (primary
54 end) to urge efficaciously the observance of the civil law
55 by deterring subjects from its transgression, for this is the
56 primary purpose of sanction and always necessary. (b) as
57 inflicted, after offense (secondary end, but not necessary
58 always) the end is the reparation of the violated civil
59 order, which penalty brings about in two ways:- a' -- by
60 destroying effect on others of evil example of offender. b'--
61 by efficaciously preventing offender from committing further
62 offense, either by his reformation, or by cutting him altogether
63 off from the community, if his existence is gravely dangerous
64 to it.

63 3. The whole question in thesis hinges on the
64 point, 'is Capital punishment a legitimate sanction?' Is it
65 forbidden by the natural law?

66 Proof I. The right of capital punishment would
67 be unjust either (a) because the killing of man is
68 intrinsically evil or (b) because perpetual imprisonment is a
69 more effective sanction, or (c) because perpetual imprisonment
70 is a sufficient sanction.

71 But, as to (a) the taking of human life is evil
72 only when it is unjust; but the State claims it justly, for the
73 State has from nature (and therefore from God the author of
74 nature and the Lord of life) all rights necessary for its
75 conservation, among which is the right of capital punishment.
76 As to (b) if perpetual punishment is a more effective sanction,
77 because a greater evil (which we deny), then the right to
78 inflict capital punishment belongs to the State, because the
79 right to a greater sanction includes the right to a less. As
80 to (c) see Proof II.

81 Proof II. The State has the right to threaten
82 (and hence to inflict) such sanction as will alone be sufficient
83 to deter subjects from the gravest crimes against the individual (murder), and against the State's existence, because it has
84 a right to the necessary means for the conservation of the life
85 of the individual and its own life. But, the only sanction
86 sufficient for these ends is capital punishment, for the evils
87 to be prevented are the greatest evils (individual's life and
88 State's existence, the basis of all individual and social good).

90 Ergo, the sanction should be the greatest, i.e., capital
91 punishment.

92 Cor. I. The argument drawn from the equality of
93 sanction to crime (life for life) is not valid, for it
94 supposes the false theory of expiation of crime for penalty;
95 besides it would imply, as a principle, that the same punish-
96 ment was always to be inflicted for the same crime, which is
97 false. Cor. II. Though the State has this right, it may happen
98 not to be opportune to exercise it, or a lesser sanction would
99 be sufficient. Cor. III. This right does not take from the
100 State the pardoning power, or the commuting power, which it
101 must possess, as the sole
102 remedy in a particular case for a too great severity of the
103 written law, or because of the greater harm that would be
104 done the common good by the infliction of the penalty.

105 Diff. I. Perpetual imprisonment is not an
106 absolute protection of the State against criminals that
107 threaten its existence, for they may secure liberty by force
108 or fraud; and besides it may happen that only the removal from
109 life of an arch-conspirator will afford security.

110 Diff. II. A man cannot judge reasonably perpetual
111 imprisonment to be a greater evil than death, for evil is
112 measured by the good it deprives us of; now life is the
113 greatest good and the basis of every other good; therefore,
114 the loss of it is the greatest temporal evil; hence, perpetual
115 imprisonment instead of capital punishment is sought by the
116 malefactor as a great favor and received with joy.

117 Diff. III Men at times make little of death; yes,
118 they expose themselves to the certain danger of death, but no
119 man views lightly the ignominious death of the criminal.

120 Diff. IV. Natural law forbids the taking of life
121 unjustly, but not justly.

122 Diff. V. The correction of the offender is the
123 secondary end of penalty, but it may be omitted when the
124 primary end calls for his death.

125 Diff. VI. The death penalty inflicted on the
126 innocent, as may happen, is irreparable. This is true, but,
127 (a) so may any penalty be irreparable, therefore, no penalty
128 would be lawful. (b) so is perpetual imprisonment, if the
129 innocent man died in prison, before his innocence is establish-
130 ed. (c) this may happen in a rare and accidental case; a risk
131 that must be run, for otherwise many dangerous criminals would
132 escape, and the common good would be imperiled.

133 Diff. VII. If evil could not be done a man for the
134 evil that he has committed, then no penalty could be justified;
135 besides the true principle holds that 'moral evil cannot be

136 done a man, because he has done evil.'

137 And hence, physical evil can be done a man, because of his
138 moral evil, the physical evil being intended as a means, not
139 an end.

140 Diff. VIII. The death penalty does not turn a
141 man into a mere means for the common good, for it does not
142 dispose of him at the State's pleasure, regardless of his
143 last end, but it does make of him a means in respect of his
144 highest temporal good, life, for man is by nature a social
145 being (as well as a private person) and he must freely
146 adjust his conduct to the civil organization of which he is
147 a part; otherwise force must be used to compel him and this
148 failing, he may be cut off altogether from the social body
149 as an infectious member, if he is a deadly menace to the well
150 being of the whole body."

Before considering the subject line-by-line and answering the argument of Boston College, I would like to admit that in shifting from the question of war to that of capital punishment I am, in a way, getting away from the subject at issue. There is sufficient reason though, rather sufficient justification, for using arguments against capital punishment to prove, or to help to prove, that war is unchristian. You will have observed that the reasons advanced by Boston College in favor of capital punishment are, in many respects, similar to those of Father Macksey supporting war. If I can prove from the Bible that capital punishment is unchristian, the proof will serve to help show the wrongfulness of war as will be brought out later. I really should have taken the question of capital punishment first and proved its error as an introduction to the argument against war. But I did not at the time of starting this work have access to the arguments advanced by Catholic theologians in support of capital punishment; in fact, I started without anything to quote from or to base my argument upon except that that was stored in the repository of my memory. Regardless of this handicap, it was necessary to begin, for there was no assurance that I would be able to get the data and the books desired, and I had only a limited time in which to present a statement of my beliefs and the reason for them before being examined by the Sanity Board at this insane asylum. Quickly as possible, I procured such books as were available. After some days I finally procured a Bible, then a certain volume of the Catholic Encyclopedia, and so on. I have been at this work for more than two weeks now, and I am still trying to get a little volume entitled "Maxims of Cardinal Gibbons." I had that volume with all my other books at Fort Douglas, but, as related before, everything that I possessed in prison was held back by those 100% Americans. This explanation is my apology for having presented the entire matter in a rather disorderly sequence. I simply did the best that I could under the circumstances. It would not do for me to say that Catholics claimed this or that; the proper thing to do was to quote the authority word for word.

Just before answering Boston College, I wish to

remark the difference between "right" and "duty." As an animal, man no doubt has the right to adopt the "eye for an eye" doctrine and defend himself with physical weapons, inflicting whatever punishment upon his adversary that occasion seems to warrant. Animals do not engage in herd warfare, because they lack the necessary brains, which is a proof of how man has advanced to a stage far below that of the animal. Peculiar kind of advance. Having adopted Christ as his model, man discards the last vestige of animality. It would be difficult to persuade the heathens that this is so, but I am now addressing myself to the enlightened. Man's duty as a Christian is superior to any right that he possesses as a bestial entity. In fact, the only right that a Christian has is to deal with his fellow men in the manner that his duty as a Christian dictates. Keeping this distinction between right and duty in mind, we will proceed.

Lines 11 to 15 read: "Kant denies that penalty has any end; it is merely the necessary consequence of crime; -- a false view, for it makes penalty itself an end, which it cannot be, as an evil; but it is always permitted as accompanying a good end, or a means to a good end."

Answer: Father Macksey disputes the foregoing, for he said under the caption of "The Right of War," that "No end justifies an immoral means." Here is a case where Catholic priests are advocating conflicting doctrines. One says that an evil is permitted as a means to a good end, while the other says, and quite correctly I believe, that no end justifies an immoral means. "Immoral" meaning not moral or wrong. We shall soon see, in the light of Christianity, that capital punishment as well as war is an immoral means.

Lines 26 and 27 refer to the "common good" which is covered also in lines 46 to 48 thusly: "for we must hold fast to the principle that the State has no power except in the measure that the end of the State demands, i.e., the common good."

Answer: God surely must have had in mind the common good when He forbade us to kill. You have observed that, in all of Boston College's argument, not one scriptural citation was offered in support of capital punishment, or to prove that the State has the Christian right to do that which the individual is forbidden to do. Since scripture condemns killing of all sorts, -- I am referring to the New Testament, which contains Christ's teachings -- and since it proposes so many antidotes for human ills, which antidotes contravene the principle of capital punishment, it seems that Boston College should either teach according to the proposals outlined in the New Testament or show its authority for failure to do so. We have no record of God delegating powers to the State that are mentioned in the arguments of my opponents. "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's" is only a part of the quotation, the remaining portion stating "And unto God the things that are God's." Unless it can be shown that God permits the individual to do that in the name of the State which he

is forbidden to do as a private citizen, then the claim that the State can kill an individual because of a crime committed, or the claim that the State can order its citizens to slaughter en masse, lacks proof. If that is not so, why use the Word of God as a rule of life?

Too, man differs concerning the common good. Some states have the death penalty, some have not. Truth is oneness. Either the death penalty is right or it is wrong. If it is right, all states should have it, and they should be able to prove, from the Word of God, that it is right. If it is wrong, all states should abolish it. The way to learn what is for the "common good" is to consult the New Testament.

Lines 52 to 55 read: "Now the end of Sanction is: (a) as threatened, beforehand (primary end) to urge efficaciously the observance of the civil law by deterring subjects from its transgression, for this is the primary purpose of sanction and always necessary."

Answer: The passage just quoted is the foundation of sand upon which capital punishment's justification is erected. Despite capital punishment, the crimes that it punishes increase. Do not discount this declaration as a delusion of an insane person, because while all the circumstances point to my insanity -- particularly my being in the insane asylum and confined in the ward for the criminally insane -- yet, there are other evidences known as government statistics. Look them up. If I were not handicapped I would get them and quote them here, but, since I do not remember the exact figures, I will not venture approximations.

Lines 63 to 65: "The whole question in thesis hinges on the point, 'is Capital punishment a legitimate sanction?' Is it forbidden by the natural law?"

Answer: You will remember Father Fox's thesis on the Natural Law, in which he said: "Human laws are valid and equitable only in so far as they correspond with, and enforce or supplement the natural law; they are null and void when they conflict with it." The natural law, according to St. Thomas, is nothing else than the rational creature's participation in the "eternal law." Can there be any conflict between God's commandments and the natural law? Are they not essentially the same thing in varied manifestations?

Lines 66 to 68: "The right of capital punishment would be unjust" if "the killing of man is intrinsically evil ..." I maintain that, according to the Word of God, the killing of man is intrinsically evil. It is always an individual who kills his fellow man; in the case that we are considering, it is often the man who springs the trap in the gallows or turns on the switch that drives current into the electric chair. Whether he kills in the name of the State or on his own initiative it is killing nevertheless. We will presently consider the State's right to kill.

Lines 71 to 75: "The taking of human life is evil only when it is unjust; but the State claims it justly, for the State has from nature (and therefore from God the author of nature and the Lord of life) all rights necessary for its conservation, among which is the right of capital punishment."

Answer: I have previously dealt with the question of "unjust killing," in which statement I proved, I believe, that all killing is unjust killing; this deals of course only with the question of killing human beings. The command to not kill was addressed to human beings and concerning human beings only; scripture makes it plain that we are not, for instance, forbidden to kill cattle for food. The Ten Commandments were rules of conduct in man's dealings with man. Now, I also dealt with the question of a State having the right, i.e. the Christian duty, to order its subjects to go to war, and I believe that I proved that such an order, if executed, violated God's law. Boston College says that "the State has from nature all rights necessary for its conservation ..." Granted! But, the remainder of the proposition that reads "among which is the right of capital punishment" is evidently false. Aside from it being wrong for Christian people to inflict the death penalty, it is quite evident that the death penalty is not necessary for the State's conservation for many states have abolished it.

In the eighth chapter of St. John we learn the story of the woman taken in adultery; and the Catholic Bible heads this chapter with the statement "Christ justifies His doctrine." Verses one to eleven relate the tale. According to the Law of Moses, this woman should have been stoned to death. Her accusers brought her before Christ and called our Lord's attention to the Mosaic requirement, and then, to tempt Jesus and to put His doctrine to a test, the scribes and Pharisees asked Him: "But what sayest Thou?" And Jesus answered: "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her." How unAmerican! From the viewpoint of Law and Order, Christ surely deserved to be crucified; that is the "law and order" of a certain brand, the 100% kind -- you know. Well the good book goes on to relate: "But they hearing this, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest. And Jesus alone remained, and the woman standing in the midst." Concluding, Jesus said: "Neither will I condemn thee. Go, and now sin no more."

Yes. Christ justified His doctrine. There are many in prison tonight who should be on the outside looking in. There are many outside prison tonight who should be on the inside looking out. The same is true of the death penalty. If the civil law functioned impartially, there are many in the seats of the high and the mighty who would swing at sunrise tomorrow morning. Seldom does a wealthy man pay the death penalty. Often an innocent poor man dies unjustly. Man cannot straighten out the tangle in any other way than to apply Christ's teachings. If the citizens of my state -- Colorado -- or of any other state, were to take a murderer before Christ and say: "The law of our state provides that such an one be hanged; what sayest Thou?" And then, if Christ replied just a

trifle differently, and, in place of telling the one without sin to first pull the rope, suppose He said: "Those whom I, as God, know have, during their lives, sinned as greatly as this murderer, will first be hanged, after which the law will be carried out in his case." What do you suppose would happen? My guess is that a good-sized delegation of respectable citizens would suggest that Christ give them an opportunity to change the laws of their State, since after all, many of the provisions on the statute books were slightly out -- or well out -- of harmony with Christianity.

If God would not condemn the woman taken in adultery, why should man condemn her? And bear in mind that adultery in those days was considered worthy of the death penalty! To determine what Christ would do in a given case, we have only His words to guide us. The more one studies what He taught, the more inescapable is the conclusion that Christ would not inflict the death penalty, and Christ would not go to war. As Christians following His example, we have no right to act differently than He would act under similar circumstances. And He has promised us the support of His heavenly Father that will enable us to meet and to overcome life's problems, which problems include the question of war and the handling of those who jeopardize communal interests.

One time I was impaneled as a prospective juror in Denver's west side criminal court. Asked why I wanted to be excused from jury service, I told Judge Wright that no matter what case I was drawn for, no matter what the evidence showed, I would, in every case, vote for acquittal. I explained to him that society is responsible for at least 95% -- if not more -- of the crimes that are committed, and it is unjust to punish an individual for something that society is largely responsible for. Judge Wright saw to it that I was not assigned to jury service on criminal cases, he excused me, and I left the courtroom. All things considered, I was perhaps a greater criminal than the poor unfortunates upon whom I was called to sit in judgment. If Christ were standing there and said to the prospective jurors: "He that is without sin among you, let him first come into the jury box," I feel rather certain that Judge Wright would have had more pleas for relief from jury service because of pressing business engagements.

Lines 81 to 91 deal with the State's right to inflict punishment sufficient to deter subjects from murder, and therefore, "the sanction should be the greatest, i.e., capital punishment." If the death penalty were actually a deterrent, there would be some excuse for the argument just quoted; considered, of course, aside from the Christian viewpoint. But the facts are against Boston College. If anything, the death penalty acts more as a deterrent to morality than against the commission of crime. It has been observed that, in some states, where the death penalty had been abolished, crime was at a lower ebb than where capital punishment still prevailed. The Law of Compensation seems to demand a reckoning with those states that blunder in this important matter. Unfortunately, I cannot quote statistics in support of the

statement that I have just made regarding crime in states that do and that do not have capital punishment, but the fault lies in the fact of my confinement and not in lack of statistics, for the latter can be procured easily by anyone caring to take the trouble. But even though experience proved that the death penalty was necessary in order to check crime -- which it does not -- we would not then be justified in ignoring what Christ said in Matthew 7:12 which reads: "All things therefore whatsoever you would that men should do unto you, do you also to them. For this is the law and the prophets."

The words of Christ just quoted are often referred to as The Golden Rule. If this Golden Rule were applied, there were no need of armies nor of hangmen. Translated into a rather common expression, the rule reads: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Regarding war: Do we want other nations to war upon us? Then, according to Christ, we should not war upon them! Never mind what they do to us, never mind about the "defend ourselves" argument, but first ask, leaving all other considerations aside: "Do we want other nations to war upon us?" The answer determines how we should act toward them. Those who answer the question honestly, will say: "No; we do not want to be warred upon." Which, according to the simple rule of Christ's that we are now considering, means: America disarm, for your armament is a stumbling block, it will lead you into temptation!

Applying the Golden Rule to capital punishment, let us quote and consider lines 114 to 116 of Boston College's argument: "Hence, perpetual imprisonment instead of capital punishment is sought by the malefactor as a great favor and received with joy." I believe that what is here said would apply to every individual without exception. If you or I were condemned to die, we would receive commutation to life imprisonment with joy. That being the case, we should extend clemency to every person condemned to death, otherwise we would fail to do unto others as we would have them do unto us. And, bear in mind, Christ said: "This is the law."

I know from personal experience that Boston College stated the truth about receiving perpetual imprisonment instead of capital punishment with joy. It may not be out of place to state the instance. I am not afraid to die; I believe that most people are game when it comes to the matter of death. Yet, we prefer to live; at least I do. I faced death on this hunger strike, and as I told my mother who visited me on the 12th day that I was without food: "I am ready to die and will die before I eat, unless released from prison." Things turned out differently, they fed me forcibly; "they" means the authorities that are keeping me in prison. Well, I have strayed a little from what I wanted to tell you. Col. Schultz came to the prison one afternoon and said: "Get ready, you are going to leave here tomorrow morning." I knew that in leaving that particular prison -- the Camp Dodge guard house -- I would start on my final journey to either serve my sentence or

dangle at the end of a noose. I did not ask Col. Schultz where I was to be taken. Not because I did not want to know, but because I felt that he would not tell me, such things are usually kept secret. We prisoners talked the matter over. Two others and myself were convinced that, in the light of numerous incidents, that I was going to be hung. At my trial by court-martial, the Judge Advocate had plead for the death penalty. A few weeks previous to my final journey, I had been given a last opportunity to join a non-combative branch of the army and thus escape the penalty of the court-martial, and I had refused to avail myself of that opportunity. At the time of this offer, I was under the impression that I had been given a certain sentence in prison, but subsequent happenings seemed to disprove this. The war was at its height, and Brandenborg, Iverson and myself often talked over the likelihood of our being hung as an example for the warning of others not to take the C.O. stand. Details are unnecessary. I was pretty well convinced that it was a case of swing. I was ready. I wrote cheerful letters to my wife and mother, told them that I did not know what the sentence was, but not to worry, to take whatever came, and that God would care for them. I did not let them know that I fully expected to dangle from the gallows before the letters reached them.

I had been sleeping in the bed occupied by a colored chap who had been hung a few months before. I witnessed the hanging, will mention it later. Anyway, having been assigned to that bed seemed to have been a bad omen. This I reasoned as I was preparing to leave, although when I first crawled into the hay on my first night in that prison, I paid no attention to the circumstance. I said little to Brandenborg and to Iverson about my thoughts of hanging, but I could see myself dangling at the end of the rope. The little conversation that I did have with my fellow prisoners between the time that I was notified and the time that I left, was not about what I firmly believed was going to happen to me, for I made up my mind to let it come. Mentally, I prepared to face the music in the proper spirit. The following morning I was told that I would not be taken away until during the afternoon, which increased my suspicion that there was going to be a hanging bee. I will not mention details, but the hours rolled on. Soon, within about fifteen minutes, I would be on my journey. A certain officer told me -- rather confidentially, but authoritatively -- that my sentence was 25 years at hard labor in the Fort Leavenworth prison. Believe me, to quote Boston College, I "received that message with joy." It was a hard blow to my loved ones, but if they knew how welcome it sounded to my ears they would have been overjoyed to read the news. Right away I got the letters that I had sent home and told them the news, told them just what the sentence was. It made me feel good to write that prison sentence down, it looked so much nicer than a death sentence. This may sound cowardly, but if it is, I'll admit that I am a coward, for I was glad not to die despite the fact that, had I been led to the gallows, I am certain the ordeal would not have been so very severe for I had fully prepared myself. But, to repeat, I was glad to not die. And no

sane person -- you see, I was sane at that time -- would prefer death to prison. No matter how long the sentence, you feel that some day you will again be free. I believe it was Pope who said: "Hope springs eternal in the human breast."

Since in the case of ourselves, we would prefer to not die, then, according to Christ's Golden rule, we ought to not sentence others to die. "This is the law," Christ says, and if this law is in conflict with the law of the State, then, as cited in a quotation from Father Macksey, the State law must give precedence to God's law.

Lines 99 to 104 read: "This right does not take from the State the pardoning power, or the commuting power, which it must possess, as the sole remedy in a particular case for a too great severity of the written law, or because of the greater harm that would be done the common good by the infliction of the penalty."

Answer: What I have just quoted is quite convenient to invoke when a rich man is sentenced or liable to be sentenced to die. It would be a great harm to the common good for a rich man to die. Poor men, too, are sometimes rescued from the gallows. It would not however, take very long to read the names of the poor men thus saved. But the main point is: if it is right to sentence a man to death, what right has the State to commute the sentence? Right is right! If it was right, for the common good, to sentence the man to death, then the common good demands that the sentence be executed, for right is right right on to the end. God is no respecter of persons, nor does the Natural Law recognize a particular person or a "particular case." If the death penalty is right, then the phrase that I have just quoted from Boston College, lines 99 to 104, is full of error, for the State does not possess the power to alter Nature's Laws. I'll admit that the State has the right, considered from the viewpoint of the animal part of man, to kill or to not kill just as she pleases, for the animal is an experiential creature, and what is wrong to man the animal today is right tomorrow and what is right tomorrow will be wrong the day following. Not so with the laws of God! No matter what the problem, the law of God and its application is always the same. The simplicity of God's laws is staggering! And their efficacy equals the simplicity.

Lines 105 to 109: "Perpetual imprisonment is not an absolute protection of the State against criminals that threaten its existence, for they may secure liberty by force or fraud; and besides it may happen that only the removal from life of an arch-conspirator will afford security."

Answer: The foregoing quotation spells doubt. Are you willing to hang a man on the strength of doubt? "It may happen that only the removal from life of an arch-conspirator will afford security." Nothing certain about it. But, "safety first" so it

would hardly do to rely upon God for the "security" that Boston College mentions. What a mistake Christ made in not condemning that adulteress! Such dreamers as He seem to not reckon with the need of future security. If, as Boston College states, "perpetual imprisonment is not an absolute protection of the State against criminals that threaten its existence," is "removal from life" the only choice that is left? In Matthew 7: 7 Christ tells us: "Ask, and it shall be given you: seek, and you shall find: knock, and it shall be opened to you." Was Christ deceiving us, or did He mean what He said? Since He admonished us in the same chapter to do unto others as we should have them do unto us, and since we know that if we got into trouble we would not want to be put to death, then, according to "The Law" as Jesus stated it, it becomes our duty to spare the offender. Now, since we are going to spare him, we are warned by Boston College that his very existence threatens the State's existence, threatens the lives of his fellow citizens. How are we to escape this danger? Christ has told us in Mark 11: 24 and 25 that we are obliged, under His rule, to forgive. He even warns us that, unless we forgive, we will not be forgiven. Now, we have spared this criminal's life, and we have forgiven him for the wrong that he committed. Great heavens! What is going to happen to the common good under such mad procedure? Quite simple: "Ask and it shall be given to you." What shall be given to you? Protection, security, peace, and anything good that you want. There is nothing good that God will not delight in providing you with; to get it, the only requisites are that you forgive injuries and then ask God for what you want. If you do not believe that He will give it to you, since He has promised it, then why do you try to persuade yourself that you are a Christian? You cannot bribe your way into the Promised Land that way. The only road to heaven is faith and good works. If you say that you believe in God, but do not practice your faith by applying it to the everyday affairs of life, then it will avail you nothing, for St. James says: "Faith without works is dead."¹⁸

What I have just said applies with equal or even greater force to the question of war. Forgive injuries, do unto others as you wish to be done by, ask God for protection and security and peace, and the whole problem is settled. These are the only weapons needed for the protection of the citizens from others' wrong-doing, regardless of whether those "others" are one or more persons residing in your own city or an army of soldiers intent upon conquering your land and making slaves of the people. If what I have just affirmed is untrue, then Christianity is a delusion.

It will be repeating, but I want to again quote St. Paul. This citation should be repeated a million times, burned into the mind of man: "Revenge not yourselves, my dearly beloved; but give place unto wrath, for it is written: Revenge is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord. But if thy enemy be hungry, give him to eat: if he thirst, give him to drink. For, doing this, thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head. Be not overcome by evil, but overcome evil by good." Does capital punishment overcome evil by good? It overcomes the victim's body with a good hanging or a good shooting, but it does not overcome the evil.

One of the mistakes made in capital punishment and in war is that we reckon only with the physical. We dispatch the physical manifestation of the evil, leaving the evil itself unconquered. Kill ten million men in war, and within twenty years a new crop of cannon fodder has been raised for the profiteers; Satan gets busy; the Christian ministers bless the fresh outbreak with their sanction because it is a holy and just war and is going to put an end to all wars; the bullets whistle and the cannons roar; and then millions of little wooden crosses tell the story of a patriotic duty well performed. Father Time sits back in his easy chair and awaits the next hysteria. Thus is Satan's dominion extended. All through the ages the bodies of millions have been ground in the grist of Mars, but the evil itself is unsubdued, for it cannot be subdued except by the work of the spirit which overcomes evil with good. In the case of capital punishment, it is capital for the Devil for it accords with his ideas, cannot ruin his business for it only destroys men's bodies. If capital punishment were an effective anodyne, the particular ills of humanity that it attempts to opiate would be sleeping as soundly as the unfortunate victims whom it robs of God's greatest temporal gift to man.

Lines 122 to 124 read: "The correction of the offender is the secondary end of penalty, but it may be omitted when the primary end calls for his death." You will remember that the primary end was held to be that of urging efficaciously the observance of the civil law by deterring subjects from its transgression. History records the fact that it does not deter; we have already considered that matter though, so we will examine the secondary end, viz: the correction of the offender. This reminds me of a story, which I believe, sufficiently covers the question of "correction." Sambo, a colored gentleman, had led a wicked life. He had many chances to reform, but chose to continue on the pathway of sin. He was standing on the gallows' platform ready for execution. The sheriff said: "Sambo! Is there anything that you wish to say before you are hurled into eternity?" Sambo bowed his head, and after apparently thinking for about a minute he suddenly looked up and replied: "Yessah Boss! I jus' merely wishes to state that, this yar hangin' am suttlenly gwin ter be a lesson to me."

Lines 125 to 128 read: "The death penalty inflicted on the innocent, as may happen, is irreparable. This is true, but, so may any penalty be irreparable, therefore, no penalty would be lawful."

Answer: In the case of penalties other than death, they are reparable because when it is learned that an innocent person has been punished, commensurate amends can easily be made. Not so with the man whose life has been taken. Among my personal belongings that the Fort Douglas patriots have virtually confiscated, I have a number of newspaper clippings, instances of innocent persons who were executed. I did not attempt to remember names, dates, places, because I believed that if I ever wished to refer to the clippings I would have access to them. Since my insanity has placed 2,500 miles between me and those clippings, I might as well

not try to lay my hands upon them. I remember two cases quite distinctly. One told of a young man in the Northwest who, not long ago, confessed to having murdered his mother several years back. This young man's father was hung for the murder of the boy's mother; that is, the husband was hung for the murder of his wife, circumstantial evidence indicated his guilt, his son was the star witness against him. The boy grew to manhood, became a prosperous farmer, but outer wealth did not soothe the pain of conscience, and he confessed to the murder for which his father paid the death penalty in consequence, principally, of the real murderer's perjured testimony. Another case in the south: Two years ago the victim stood upon the gallows and the next minute his body dropped through the trap door; through some defect, the rope snapped and the so-called criminal landed on the ground unhurt. His attorney won a technical battle, claiming that the law could not punish the man twice for the same offense. But, awaiting final settlement of the dispute, the so-called criminal spent two years in the penitentiary. After two years, another death scene was being enacted in a far away hospital, and, before passing on to his eternal destiny, the sick man confessed to the murder for which an innocent person was nearly hanged -- saved only by an accident -- and for which he had already served two years in prison. The state legislature -- Tennessee, I believe -- awarded the innocent man \$5,000 for unjust imprisonment. Suppose the State had succeeded in taking his life? Year after year, capital punishment results in the execution of many innocent people. No chance for reparation after injustice is found out. The same thing happens in war! Millions are killed innocently; the real culprits escape injury. Of course, in war, you will claim that it becomes necessary to kill the innocent millions in order to prevent those innocent millions from killing other millions of innocents. But the fallacy of your contention lies in the fact that, in the first place, you only add to the casualty list by engaging in mortal combat; secondly, if you would overcome evil with good the invincible power of God would shield the innocent from danger. If God's power would not shield the innocent, then religion is a snare and the New Testament a book of lies. Even though a great number lost their lives in returning good for evil -- which loss I believe would not happen -- such an eventuality would not mean that Christ's rule had failed, the spirit would have conquered. I believe that the number of martyrs since the dawn of Christianity is listed at 18,000,000. Have they lost anything by adhering to Christ's rule to not resist evil, to overcome evil with good?

Returning to capital punishment. Three weeks ago the daily papers told about Bill Wilson, a victim of circumstantial evidence. He was sentenced to life imprisonment -- the account did not state how long ago -- for the murder of his wife and child, following their disappearance from Blount County, Montgomery, Ala. He was later pardoned, when his wife and child returned from a northern state and he will soon move to a nicely equipped farm, purchased by the State and presented to him as a recompense for the

miscarriage of justice in his case.

It may have seemed unnecessary to cite instances, since Boston College admitted that the death penalty is at times inflicted upon the innocent and that the wrong is irreparable. Now, Boston College concludes in its statement about the innocent: "but, so may any penalty be irreparable, therefore, no penalty would be lawful." The penalties that God inflicts are not irreparable, nor are any of His penalties unlawful. If we leave the entire matter of punishment to Him, He will handle every case just as it should be handled, there will not be the slightest chance of injustice creeping in, wrong will be done to none, unrighteousness will be requited, the interests of all safeguarded, for God is the Father of all and He is deeply concerned over the welfare of His children, therefore, He will not permit the few to harm the many. But, if the many insist upon an alliance with the Devil by using the Devil's weapons, then they must accept the Devil's payment, for God can have nothing to do with evil.

Lines 130 to 132 of Boston College's argument continue to deal with the possibility of punishing the innocent, and state that the risk "must be run, for otherwise many dangerous criminals would escape, and the common good would be imperiled." If we would keep in mind the words of St. Paul: "Revenge not yourselves, my dearly beloved; but give place unto wrath, for it is written: Revenge is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord," then we would not be running any risk of punishing the innocent, for God in His wisdom would punish only the guilty and He would punish them as much as they deserved. If the common good would be endangered by leaving the question of punishment to God, then it was a crime for God to place upon us the burden of leaving such things to Him. Are you ready to accuse God of crime?

Lines 133 and 134: "If evil could not be done a man for the evil that he has committed, then no penalty could be justified." Agreed! Man cannot justify himself in the imposition of penalty, because Christ has made it clear that we should judge not, that we are to not resist evil, that we are to return good for evil. All of which are the very antipodes of doing evil to a man for the evil which he has committed. Dogs, snakes, animals in general have the right to return evil for evil. Man, as an animal, enjoys this right with them. But, as a Christian endowed with the spiritual and intellectual weapons, it is his duty to supplant the use of claw and fang with the subtle alchemy of love.

A little more than two years ago -- it was on July 5, 1918 -- I attended a public hanging at which three negroes were executed simultaneously. Twenty-five thousand or thereabouts witnessed the execution. It took place at Camp Dodge, Iowa, all present were forced to attend. They lined 161 Conscientious Objectors close to the gallows, that is, comparatively close, of course many were closer than we were. We were brought to the scene of the

hanging deceitfully, but once there we were surrounded by thousands of soldiers and to attempt leaving the premises without permission was an act of insanity. At my court-martial trial, which took place about three weeks later, an officer on the court inquired if I were the man that raised the "rumpus" at the hanging. But my "rumpus" availed nothing, for I was compelled to stay and witness this holy act of Christians assembled for the purpose of conserving the common good. I wish that all hangings and executions of every kind were held in public, because I believe that it would teach people as nothing else will. At this particular hanging there were thousands of soldiers to whom the occasion was so revolting that they swore vengeance upon those who ever tried to "pull off a stunt like that again." The moments were tense, many lost their minds, some became raving maniacs, and the air reverberated with the shrieks of anguished onlookers and the moans and the prayers of the three men standing upon the gallows. The last words of one of them: "I want to tell you again that I am innocent; but go ahead." The three bodies dropped at the same time. The world was made safe for decent people to live in, crime was at an end! If not so sad it would be silly! My "rumpus" consisted in a gentlemanly request that I be permitted to leave the scene of this triple murder before the crime was committed. My request was denied, and I shouted to Lt. Wigbells: "If we knew where we were coming you would never have been able to get us here." I had to shout to him because his dignity did not allow him to come over to where I could talk without shouting. I do not know how Wigbells felt about the hanging, he may have objected to it as much as the C.O.s or he may have favored it. But, in any event, even though we knew where we were bound for, and even though we refused to go, they likely would have bundled us into a conveyance and taken us to the scene of the tragedy. It was a good thing they made everybody attend the affair. A law ought to be passed making it compulsory for the citizens of every community to attend every execution in the community. If this were done, Boston College would soon alter its thesis on Capital Punishment.

Lines 135 to 139 read: "Besides the true principle holds that 'moral evil cannot be done a man, because he has done evil.' And hence, physical evil can be done a man because of his moral evil, the physical evil being intended as a means, not an end."

Answer: The foregoing seems to admit on the moral plane that evil should not be returned for evil. But fearful that man might become elevated, it drags the moral down to the level of the physical and justifies the return of physical evil for a moral evil; whereas, the Christian doctrine is to return good for evil. If the evil be moral, we should return physical and moral good; if the evil be physical, we should return physical and moral good; if the evil be both moral and physical, we should return physical and moral good. "To no man rendering evil for evil."¹⁹

Lines 144 to 150, which conclude Boston College's argument, read: "For man is by nature a social being (as well as a private person) and he must freely adjust his conduct to the civil organization of which he is a part; otherwise force must be used to compel him, and this failing, he may be cut off altogether from the social body as an infectious member, if he is a deadly menace to the well being of the whole body."

Answer: Granted that man is a social being. That he must freely adjust his conduct to the civil organization is false, for the civil organization might require of him duties that are inconsistent with legitimate demands of society. That man should freely adjust his conduct to the civil organization in all cases where the latter functions within its proper sphere, I believe all will agree. Suppose that, through unscrupulous manipulations of a powerful minority, compulsory military service became a State law operative whenever an emergency was declared to exist; suppose that fifty-thousand wage-earners were on strike for working conditions that would more closely approximate the justice that they are entitled to; suppose that this strike could be broken and the workers defeated with the help of the military forces; suppose that an emergency was declared to exist and many of the workers who were on strike were drafted into the military service, thus being used to defeat themselves and their fellow men. Should these workers "freely adjust their conduct" to the requirements of the civil organization in the instance cited? In France, by declaring a national emergency to exist, they call men to the colors for strike-duty. In that case the law itself is wrong, and any liberty-loving citizen would refuse to obey it. You never hear of the military forces being used to break a strike of the financiers! The bankers have gone on strike time and again, but the militia was never called out. The food hogs go on strike, charge exorbitant prices and refuse to sell for less, dump surplus produce into the river, resort to every known kind of respectable sabotage, but the military forces are not used except to quiet rebelling elements among the starving populace. It is a one-sided affair.

Boston College, however, perhaps did not intend to be so broad in the application of the theory that a man must freely adjust his conduct to the civil organization of which he is a part. We will suppose a case that was more likely in mind. A man has committed willful murder; he has failed to live up to the requirements of his communal obligations. Boston College says that force must be used to compel him. Is not life imprisonment sufficient force? Boston College said in lines 131 and 132 that many dangerous criminals would escape and the common good be imperiled. If dangerous criminals escape, that is the fault of the State, they ought to safeguard the common good against such escape by adequate guard. The State's carelessness or inefficiency is no excuse for taking a man's life in order to get him out of the way. As a disciple of Christ, I disfavor the use of physical force in compelling a man to adjust his conduct to the civil organization.

of which he is a part; but, for the purpose of disproving the need of capital punishment, I am going to temporarily place myself in the position of sanctioning such use of physical force. Boston College says that if a man does not freely adjust his conduct to the civil organization of which he is a part, force must be used to compel him, and this failing, he may be cut off altogether if he is a deadly menace to the well being of the whole body. Force can never compel a man to do that that society wishes him to do. But, society can use physical force as a restraint, to prevent a man from committing murder; in other words, it can securely lodge a man behind walls of stone and bars of steel. I oppose this procedure, but I am pointing out that society has the physical power to do as mentioned, which precludes the necessity of killing a man because he is a deadly menace to society.

Society is often a deadly menace to the individual, particularly in the cases where it executes the innocent. Who is going to punish society for its transgressions, for its oppression of the poor, for its laws that unjustly murder people on the industrial field as well as on the gallows? Unfortunately, that has to be left to God. If there were any way that Christians could take it out of God's hands, they would save Him the bother of punishing those who really deserve greater punishment than the unfortunate wretches that happen to be caught in the clutches of man's law. Since Christians have no way of punishing the State for its crimes, they firmly believe that God will balance the account and make proper amends to all concerned. But, in the case of the State dealing with the individual, Christians are able to interpose God's plan and therefore they will not trust Him.

Summing up the argument of Boston College: That capital punishment is an evil is admitted, but it is justified on the ground of necessity for the welfare of the common good. In both particulars, the argument is similar to that used on behalf of war. Summing up my reply: The flames of evil must be extinguished with the water that flows from the good Spirit within us, otherwise the flames will not be extinguished but will spread with greater fury.

Consider a parallel: Lynching has become quite fashionable in America. We average one lynching about every four days throughout the year. Quite properly, the Catholic Church condemns lynching, but it goes on merrily. It does not, however, cure the diseases that it combats, and, incidentally, many innocent persons are lynched just as in the cases of capital punishment and war. I regret that I am without the Catholic Encyclopedia that covers lynching. I could get it within a few days, but I had best finish without it, for, as in previous cases, I might be fooled on the "few days" theory and have to wait several days. One is somewhat handicapped in an insane asylum. Anyway, my recollection of the Catholic's stand on lynching is that the mob usurps the authority of the State and moreover does not give the victim a fair trial. Too, the mob is without sanction of the Natural Law, is the substance

of one of its arguments I believe.

In the case of an innocent person, all will agree that he should not be lynched. We will consider only those who are guilty. If it is wrong to lynch a guilty person, then capital punishment is wrong; and if both these games are wrong, then war is wrong. This is a mere statement, but I will offer proof.

A mob lynches a person for three reasons, principally, the same reasons that Catholic theologians use to justify war. 1. For defense; the common good demands that such a menace be cut off from the main body. 2. For punishment; as Boston College says: "physical evil can be done a man, because of his moral evil"; and, as Father Macksey pointed out in the case of war, punitive treatment proportionate to the value of the right involved. 3. For future security; as a warning to others and to get rid of this public menace. Just as in the cases of capital punishment and war. Now, since the reasons actuating the mob are the same as those that motivate the State in inflicting capital punishment or prosecuting a war, the only question to be decided is that of authority. Lynching is branded by Catholic theologians as murder, because it lacks official sanction. I maintain that the State has no more right to take life than a mob has. I agree that lynching is murder, and I declare that capital punishment and war also are murder. Nowhere has God delegated to a group the right to do that that He forbids individuals to do. If He had conferred such power, it would be an easy matter to produce the evidence, which Catholic theologians have not done. The mob often feels that the State is lax in dealing with criminals, that it is not fulfilling its function according to the Natural Law as interpreted by Fathers Macksey and Fox, and, therefore, in order to properly serve the interests of the common good, the mob does that that it fears the State will be negligent in attending to, and it bases its fears upon experience. In other words, the mob, according to its view, is doing the duty that the State fails to perform. If the State will not put an end to crime, the mob will; so reasons the mob. All wrong of course, so far as the killing part is concerned, but if the State should fail to police the highways, the mob would assume this duty and feel that it was doing the proper thing. If the State failed to maintain a sanitary standard, the mob would take matters into its own hands for the interests of the common good. If the State failed to keep the roads in proper condition, and the mob learned from experience that the State was inclined to neglect its duty in this respect, then the mob, in the interest of the common good, would organize road details. Would the mob be wrong in thus usurping the State's authority, or should the State be allowed to ignore the peace, health, and safety of its citizens? You will contend that steps should be taken to compel the State to function as it should. But the mob has tried in cases of rape and murder to compel the State to function as it should, and the State has failed, so the mob takes matters into its own hands. I do not justify the mob. I am merely attempting to briefly point out that, if the State has the right to take life, then the mob has a right under the conditions named. If the State has a right to conserve life and fails to perform its duty,

then it is the duty of the mob to act in the State's place in order that the common good may be conserved. If the mob has the right to do exclusively constructive work for the common good in a case where the State is recreant, it has the right to do the State's destructive work in a case where the State is recreant. I repeat that I do not favor the mob's act of violence, but I am simply indicating similarities.

You may argue that the State is never wanting in performance of duty with regards to the peace, health, and safety of its citizens, and that there is therefore no need of a mob assuming these duties. I will grant this, for the purpose of avoiding unnecessary discussion. But, one can suppose such a condition to exist, and, given that condition, one can then reason what would be the logical and the right thing for the mob to do. I believe that mobs do not use very much reason, they discard consideration of what is right and what is wrong. But the same seems to be true of the State, and the State is even more culpable, because it has the time to consider everything calmly and thoroughly. Yet, despite this advantage, the State, in the case of capital punishment and war, acts just as criminally as the mob.

"The State at least gives the accused a fair trial" some will contend. Well, in this case, the mob is often more merciful, for a fair trial frequently results in conviction of the innocent. Take the case of that man in the Northwest -- I believe his name was Love -- he was given a fair trial and, in addition to undergoing the torture of imprisonment for months prior to his execution, he had to sit in the courtroom and listen to false testimony tightening the noose about his neck. He perhaps could have endured the false testimony stoically, were it not that his own son was the chief conspirator. He may have known that his son was the murderer, but he kept quiet. Or, he may not have known who actually committed the crime. He did know, however, that he was guiltless. In this man's case, as in the case of all unjustly condemned and executed by the State, the mob's action is more merciful, because one is spared the long period of torturous confinement with accompanying mental agony that is far more poignant than the physical pain.

And how about a fair trial in war? The millions sentenced to death by the stroke of a sovereign's pen are not given as much of a square deal as the mob gives to its victim, nor are they afforded the protection against the wrong that a mob's victim enjoys. One attacked by a mob, is usually already in a place of safety, and the prison's security has often thwarted the mob's intent. Too, all the powers of the State come to the defense of one attacked by a mob, and, if given time, the State's army will be on the job ready to defend the victim against the mob's attack; this has happened many times. On the other hand, if the mob does get hold of its victim, it occasionally sets him free. Just a few weeks ago, an innocent person was taken from the jail by a mob in St. Catherine's, Ontario, and, after the unfortunate plead his case before his erstwhile determined

executioners, he was returned to the jail. Assuming that he was innocent -- a man must be innocent if a mob gives him up, for it is usually unprofessional for them to release a person -- then, after his civil trial, he no doubt will go free. International mobs act just contrary with their intended victims. In the first place, if a man will not march off to slaughter and to be slaughtered, he is guilty of death. Or, in their mercy, which is the result of public protest, the powers that be may permit the victim to undergo a living death for many years in a military prison. This is more in the nature of a reprieve, for in a large percentage of cases, death soon results. As I previously mentioned, the percentage of deaths in the ranks of those who refused to go to war in America -- that is, among those arrested and sent to prison -- was four times greater than in the army. It is impossible for those who refuse to go to war to establish their innocence; no matter what may be their reason: religious, humanitarian or political; they are guilty of an heinous crime. After landing in prison, in place of the State's forces being used to protect them from the mob, the State's forces join in the cry "crucify him!"

The mob, according to its views, has as much right as the State to take a man's life, for, according to the mob, the State is negligent in the performance of its duty. In the case of the innocent, the mob's expeditious treatment is more humane than that of the State's handling of those whom it eventually executes despite their innocence. Unlike the war game, the mob usually has some genuine grievance against its victim, the victim is given considerable protection against those who with some degree of justification seek his life, and, once in the hands of the mob the victim at least has a chance of final appeal which is sometimes fruitful. Despite the fact that the mob's action is fairer in every particular than the act of war, and despite the fact that it is more fair in many ways than capital punishment, lynching is branded as murder by Catholic theologians while war and capital punishment is sanctified in the name of the common good. If such absurdities are not enough to drive a man insane, I would like to know what is! Really, I am beginning to understand what made me a candidate for the mad house.

Having considered capital punishment, I will now recede to individual killing in the case of self-defense. Not homicide, but actual defense of self. I will carry the matter even beyond the question of killing, and prove, by the Word of God, that it is a Christian's duty to not resist at all with physical violence. This question should have been taken up after disposing of homicide, then followed by capital punishment, then concluded with war. But insane persons usually do things backwards. Too, the only material that I had to begin with was paper and a typewriter; with but a limited time in which to present my case, I could not afford to wait for particular documents, books, etc., for there was no certainty of getting them, and delay was inevitable. So, being insane and having to do this job as best I could without tools until such time as the tools arrived are my excuses for presenting this case against war in the order that a woman usually gets off a streetcar.

This question of individual self-defense is quite important. While not parallel to war, yet in some ways it has a marked relevancy. At least persons usually associate it with war, for one so often hears the question: "What would you do if your wife and child were attacked?" As I pursue the argument, I will admit similarities and point out dissimilarities in the matter of likening war to individual self-defense.

Boston College is again the star witness. I will quote its thesis word for word, numbering the lines so that I may afterwards answer it conveniently.

1 "Man has the right to use physical force against
2 an unjust aggressor, even to the taking of his life (due
3 regard being always had for the limitations of blameless self-
4 defence).

5 This thesis concerns mutual duties in respect to
6 life and limb, and treats of special cases of self-defence.
7 Homicide is the direct killing on private authority, and not in
8 self-defense, and is forbidden by strict justice as well as
9 charity. The same is to be said of all mutilation or bodily
10 injury.

11 This thesis treats of physical injury done a fellow-
12 man or the killing of him for the defence of self against his
13 attack. We contend that man has this Right.

14 However note the limitations of self-defence, which
15 are:- (a) the intention of the one using force must be that of
16 self-defence alone. (b) force may be used only at the time of
17 attack, and must be the only way of repelling it. (c) no more
18 injury must be than is necessary to avert actual danger.

19 Proof. Man has the Right of self-defence as
20 explained, if without it the perfect Right which man has to
21 his life in conflict with an unjust aggressor, would lose its
22 co-active power. But, without the right of self-defence as
23 explained, this perfect Right to life would not be co-active.
24 Ergo, man has the right to self-defence.

25 Min. proved. -- Because the right to life is
26 based on strict justice: it is perfect and co-active. But,
27 co-activity could not be exercised by the state, because it
28 is a case of actual aggression, nor by the individual attacked
29 (as we suppose). Therefore, the right to life would lose
30 co-active power if etc. Conform. Public security would be
31 imperiled if this Right were not admitted.

32 Cor. I. Our thesis holds also for the case of
33 the defence of limb, external liberty, material goods of
34 moment, etc. (except honor and good name, of which we treat
35 later, in Thesis LV). Cor II. This principle (the doctrine of
36 self-defence) applies also to one's defence of his neighbor,
37 which is not only a right, but also may be duty of charity.
38 Cor. III. The thesis holds also for the case of an aggressor

39 deprived of the use of reason (permanently or temporarily).
40 Schol. I. The thesis proves the right of self-
41 defence, not the duty. One may forego the exercise of a right
42 but it may be one's duty for extrinsic reasons to exercise
43 this right. Schol. II. Bodily injury in self-defence may be
44 directly intended in which case a physical and not a moral evil
45 is intended for a good end. Whether or not one can directly
46 intend the death of an aggressor is disputed. The question is
47 purely theoretical, for practically bodily injury suffices for
48 escape from the danger, at least as regards the intention of
49 one attacked. Schol. III. It is not lawful to combine
50 unjustifiable motives (e.g. revenge) with that of self-defence,
51 nor may one inflict injury in anticipation of the fact of
52 aggression.

53 Obj. I. In the use of self-defence, one might be
54 the cause of the loss of the soul of the aggressor, -- not per
55 se, but per accidens, and the one attacked has not the duty in
56 charity in preventing this evil, because the aggressor is not
57 in the condition of extreme necessity of losing his soul, since
58 the danger he is in can be escaped by desisting from aggression.
59 Obj. II. Nor is one obliged to forego self-defence, if the
60 aggressor be crazy or drunk, because this obligation would
61 exist only when these conditions are present:- if (a)
62 aggressor is certainly in mortal sin. (b) there exists a well-
63 founded hope of freeing him therefrom. (c) it is morally
64 certain that the one attacked is in the state of grace.
65 Conditions seldom or never verified in practice."

So saith Boston College.

Lines 1 to 4 concern the proposition afterwards argued upon, the substance of which is stated in lines 11, 12, 13, reading: "The thesis treats of physical injury done a fellow-man or the killing of him for the defence of self against his attack. We contend that man has this right."

Answer: Man, as an animal, has a perfect right to repel violence with violence. Man, as a Christian, has a duty to perform that transcends his mere animal rights. If the animal part of man is allowed to rule, evil will triumph. If the spiritual in him is permitted to dominate, good will overcome the evil in its adversary and good will ultimately reign in the hearts of attacker and attacked.

This again calls to mind the time when Christ and His disciples were attacked on the night before the crucifixion. As an animal, Peter had a right to use the sword. Christ reminded him though that he was a Christian, and incidentally warned those who would afterwards come upon earth that those who depended upon material weapons would perish with those weapons. Christ also made it plain that He could put to flight those who attacked Him if He cared to do so. "Thinkest thou that I cannot ask my Father, and He will give me presently more than twelve legions of Angels?"²⁰

Christ is not selfish. He can call twelve legions of Angels to our rescue when we are attacked, and He will do it if we ask Him. He promised us over and over again that anything that we ask the Father for in His name, it would be granted. It is understood of course that He referred to anything good that we would ask for; we have enough evil without asking for more. Now, the Angels whom God would send to defend us from attack can operate in millions of ways to save us, they can defend us more successfully than we can defend ourselves, but, the trouble is, we are afraid that they will get held up in some manner and will not reach the scene of disaster in time.

Reliance upon God only to the extent of saying: "My God, I trust in Thee," if that little prayer is said with faith, is better than fisticuffs or bullets. It is really disheartening to argue on this point! As little children we are told that God is all-powerful, that He has appointed a Guardian Angel over us who will guide and protect us on the thorny pathway of life, that He wants us to love others because He loves them, and that He wants us always to return good for evil. Having grown to young manhood, our parents, after many sacrifices and continued self-denial, send us to Boston College. Then we are taught a doctrine entirely at variance with our early education and the very antithesis of Christ's preachments. Acting upon the so-called truth imbibed at Boston College, we go forth to struggle in the battle of life. Other colleges have taught the same perverted doctrine, and we find millions of creatures living in mortal dread of being attacked by a fellow man. The psychic superstructure erected upon this foundation of error, fills our penitentiaries and insane asylums. Not only do those whose lives are wrecked as the inevitable sequence of this false teaching land in the penitentiaries and insane asylums, but also those who question the error. There are many hundreds in American prisons today because they taught and lived a doctrine that harmonizes with what little children learn in parochial schools.

A friend of mine named Devault used to tell me about his early experience in Leadville, Colorado. In those days each man was his own law, and every man in Leadville -- with one exception -- carried the statute books on his right hip. A great many used to carry the law on both hips. But Devault went about his affairs day after day without the protection of a six-shooter. There were many disputes, as there are in every large group of people. Often the controversy lead to a threatened attack. Self-defense was invoked, and after the smoke cleared away two things were quite in evidence: 1. The shooting did not settle anything, it merely put one of the disputants out of the way. 2. If one of the men had been without a pistol, the other would not fear the unarmed man, and the unarmed man by the very fact of being unarmed would prove that he preferred amicable settlement of the discussion; so, a decision could eventually be reached that, no matter how unsatisfactory to either or both of the contenders, would be preferable to being murdered or carrying on one's conscience the thought of having murdered a fellow man.

Devault never carried a pistol. He had his share of arguments, nor was his life less filled with trouble than the average person's life. Devault's friends and enemies were armed constantly, ready for attack and defense. Devault lived in Leadville for a long time -- I have forgotten how many years -- and he witnessed many cases of physical self-defense; jobs for the undertaker. But, during his entire residence in that city of law and order, Devault did not attack with physical weapons nor was he attacked with physical weapons. When he finally left the city, he carried with him the recollection of many who relied upon the pistol and who were then many days gone on that long journey through the Unknown.

Consider a different case: A certain army captain once boasted to me that he would never be in prison. I do not want to mention his name, for he has had enough trouble without my adding to it. Anyway, he was a law-abiding citizen, he believed in serving his country, etc., and he was certain that he would never land behind the bars. He felt quite above me as he proudly proclaimed his belief in physical force. Not long ago he got into a dispute. His pistol may or may not have induced him to carry his side of the case farther. If newspaper accounts are true, he was finally struck a blow on the face. His trusty pistol came into play. "Manslaughter" was the jury's verdict. The relatives and friends of the young man whom he killed are taught another lesson in self-defense. In years to come, Captain -- will not find the recollection of his slaying that young man quite as comforting a thought as would be a reminiscence of having overcome himself in one of life's battles.

Corporal Brown, one of the guards who brought me to this insane asylum from Fort Douglas, in telling me of self-defense cases, related an incident in Oklahoma. It seems that, at the time, the Oklahomans also carried the law on the right hip. A ruffian entered a certain store at a time when all the men were out, only a young lady remained. Soon after, two other men entered the store and the first one who had gone in before them, having previously attacked the young lady, made certain that the intruders would not reach their law books before he reached his. His aim was good, two shots rang out and two intruders dropped dead. If these men were known to settle things peacefully, if they did not have the evidence of physical violence strapped to their belts, the beast who first entered the store would have had no fear of them, they could have entered without danger, and the presence of their moral force alone would no doubt have saved the girl. God's influence is ever present with the man walking in the might of His power, and who can resist God's influence? What is true of individuals is true of nations.

Aside from Christ's precepts clearly indicating that it is our duty to not resist evil except with spiritual and intellectual forces, there are innumerable and repeated examples

in every day life that prove to us that it had been better to use Christ's weapons.

Lines 16 and 17 of Boston College's argument read: "(b) force may be used only at the time of attack, and must be the only way of repelling it."

Answer: Again we have met the "last resort" argument of Father Macksey's. As in the case of war force -- physical force -- is not the "only way of repelling" an attack. While the "turn the other cheek" philosophy of Christ's is in a certain sense harder to apply, yet we have the help of God in applying it and it will be more effective than physical force. The case of a crazy person may come to your mind. That will be considered at the proper time. We are now considering persons of normal mentality. So many say that a person with red blood in his veins would not childishly turn the other cheek. Call the blood any color you want, but it takes a man of courage to turn the other cheek. It takes a real hero to "not resist evil." Anybody can strike back with the fist, but it requires a man to overcome with power of the mind. Every man can do it though, for the spirit of God reinforces the mind of man. Boston College's argument is already proven to be false, for it states that one of the limitations of self-defense is that it "must be the only way of repelling" the attack. We learn from the abundant testimony of Jesus that there is another and a better way of defending ourselves. The significant feature of arguments favoring war, capital punishment, and individual self-defense with the use of physical force, is the absence of scripture in support of the various theses. If Christ favored the things mentioned, it should be an easy matter to produce His testimony. You will remember that I quoted the arguments on war, capital punishment, and self-defense in full, copied them word for word, but the teachings of Christ were conspicuous by their absence.

Lines 30 and 31: "Public security would be imperiled if this Right were not admitted." On the contrary, the exercise of the animal right to use physical force against an unjust aggressor is the very thing that imperils public security.

Lines 32 to 34: "Our thesis holds also for the case of the defence of limb, external liberty, material goods of moment, etc." In other words, if a robber enters your home you should defend your material goods "with physical force even to the taking of his life." From the Christian viewpoint, it were better to allow a robber to dispossess us of a million dollars rather than kill him or even injure him, either physically or morally. God has millions of ways of returning the million dollars; He may not return dollars or He may do so; but one thing is certain: one will not lose by treating robbers and all others according to God's remedy. In Rev. John Haynes Holmes' book "New Wars for Old" he tells of an incident where a bishop gave lodging in his own home to a paroled criminal. Next morning, after having been hospitably treated by the bishop, the criminal thanked him for his kindness and left the

house. Soon after the criminal's departure, the bishop noticed that certain valuables had been taken. Hastening in the direction of the criminal, he overtook him, brought him back to the house, gave him the silver candlesticks and sent him on his way. The modern method would have been to call the police and secure another jail sentence for the unfortunate. But, the bishop of whom Holmes wrote, treated the criminal in the manner that Christ urged in Matthew 5: 40.

Lines 35 to 37 read: "This principle (the doctrine of self-defence) applies also to one's defence of his neighbor, which is not only a right, but also may be a duty of charity."

Answer: You cannot perform a "duty of charity" with uncharitable weapons, for while the end would be an act of charity, the means would be a negation of it, and as Father Macksey said: "No end justifies an immoral means." The 13th chapter of St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, which I previously quoted in full, gives an excellent definition of charity. Open your Bible and read that chapter. The New Standard Dictionary defines charity thusly: "Readiness to overlook faults; leniency. Christian love." I cannot fathom how the erudite professors of Boston College harmonize the definitions just quoted with the use of "physical force against an unjust aggressor, even to the taking of his life." Still, I suppose my insanity quite completely explains my failure to comprehend.

"One's neighbor" would include any person or persons. My mother, my wife, my child are my neighbors. Should I stand by and see them attacked? No! My mother has lived a long time, and she has never been attacked to my knowledge. But, if she were attacked, I could do more to defend her by reliance upon God's weapons than I could by resort to physical force. Evil is evil, no matter where it is or how it asserts itself it is evil nevertheless. And God said to overcome evil with good. If we are determined to do this, God will be standing by to see that we succeed. If, as a Christian, you do not believe this, then read your Bible. If, after reading the Bible you do not believe it, then you are ready to renounce Christianity. One cannot use physical violence either offensively or defensively and live according to Christ's teachings. So I am going to rely upon prayer to prevent attacks upon my mother, wife, child, all my relatives and friends; if this preparedness fails and the attack is made or on the verge of being made, I pray that God will give me the grace to still rely upon Him, to use only spiritual and intellectual weapons against the assailant. And I know that my loved ones and the individual or individuals attacking will be spared.

I purposely omitted lines 19 to 24, but will now quote them. This lack of sequence does not injure Boston College's

argument, for it is quoted in full previously. The section just referred to reads: "Proof. Man has the Right of self-defence as explained, if without it the perfect Right which man has to his life in conflict with an unjust aggressor, would lose its co-active power. But, without the Right of self-defence as explained, this perfect Right to life would not be co-active. Ergo, man has the right to self-defence."

Granted that the man attacked has a right to his life. But so has the attacker. The case that I stated a while ago, of a young man being killed by Captain ---, the young man had just as much right to his life as Captain --- had to the Captain's life. If the Captain were not a disciple of physical force, the circumstances of the case were such that he would likely have avoided the incident altogether. It was the outgrowth of a really trivial incident. Most crimes are such. The rule of "overcome evil with good" would have worked admirably in this instance; and it will do so in every instance. Suppose that I am attacked? For all I know, God is better pleased with the man who attacks me than He is with me. On the whole, my life may be more sinful than that of the one who attacks me. Perhaps I deserve to be attacked. Fact is, I know that I deserve it. There are not many in this world of saints who do not deserve a good beating, perhaps killing. Not from man's view point, for man is told to not judge; but from God's viewpoint.

On the other hand, the attacker may be in mortal sin, and to kill him you would cause the loss of his soul. We do not know, cannot ascertain all the facts. To be on the safe side: overcome evil with good. Finally, concerning the lines in the argument just previously quoted, I will repeat that man, as an animal, enjoys the same right as a bulldog. As a Christian, however, the right of an animal is superseded by the duty of a Christian.

Now, you will remember that lines 32 to 34 claimed the right to take a man's life in the defense of material goods of "moment." I do not know what "moment" means. Five dollars is of great moment to one person, while to another five thousand dollars would be of little moment. In each case it is an instance of "material goods of moment." For instance: a greedy employer robs his workmen of their earnings. For illustration we will say that one of the workers was robbed of five hundred dollars during the year. This sum is of "great moment" to a workingman. Has the workingman the right to slay the employer in self-defense? You will say that, in this instance, killing is not a last resort. Granted! But, the workman has tried every other means, and he has failed to get justice; little Johnny died during the year as the result of low wages, for daddy could not buy proper food and sufficient food; Johnny took ill; his power of resistance was so low that he could not successfully combat the disease. Will the workman wait until his other child is killed before he defends his family against the greedy employer? If the argument of Boston College were sound, workmen who are robbed of their earnings to

the point of great moment, could, in self-defense, slay the robber. But, fortunately, such an act is not necessary. There is another and more effective method of redress.

Consider the matter from another angle: The workman's home was entered and five-hundred dollars stolen on the installment plan, and it took a year to make the haul by means of withholding a part of the workman's just earnings week by week. But now a highwayman -- not the respectable kind -- breaks into the home of a person who is not suffering for the want of life's necessaries, but through a year of frugality he has managed to save five hundred dollars, and he has the money hidden in his home. The highwayman just "stuck up" a few parties down the street but did not make a good enough haul, so he is now in the room of the aforementioned customer who tells him that he hasn't got any money. The "sticker-up" does not believe his customer, and having been disappointed in his business down the street he is in no humor for trifling, so he threatens his victim with certain death if the latter does not fork-over immediately. Friend victim can, by certain maneuvering, lead the robber into believing that he is going to get the money, and then by a quick move pierce the robber's heart with a bullet. This money means a great deal to the victim, it took a year to save it, and upon its investment depends the man's future. According to Boston College the invaded has the right to wound the invader "even to the taking of his life" if such "be the only way of repelling" the burglar. But, according to Christ, the thief should be allowed to carry off his loot in the event that he cannot be persuaded of the sinfulness of his act. Then, in His own way, God will make amends.

Lines 38 and 39 state: "The thesis holds also for the case of an aggressor deprived of the use of reason (permanently or temporarily)." A man crazed or drunk cannot be dealt with in the same manner that a sane person possessed of his faculties is handled. Yet, even in the case of those insane or intoxicated, the mystical power of God has an all-pervading influence. Too, those who have temporarily or permanently lost their minds can usually be restrained without inflicting bodily injury. I have witnessed a great many cases of a drunken man virtually running amuck, but, in every instance, the offender was quieted without physically injuring him. Last week, Dr. Karpman was in my cell in this prison, talking with me, and just as he left he was swiftly approached by a lunatic who was going to "mash his head to a jelly." Doctor Karpman was quite cool, talked kindly to the patient, but the latter had delusions that kindness could not penetrate. By this time, however, attendants rushed to the scene, the patient was restrained from attacking the Doctor without even holding him. Quite likely, if the Doctor were alone during the whole of the conversation, he would have been struck a fearful blow, but it was only a matter of a few seconds until aid reached him. The patient was later locked in a cell, no harm done to anybody. Had the doctor struck the patient in self-defense, both might have been severely injured.

From what I know of Doctor Karpman, I believe that if he were alone at the time this lunatic attacked him, he would have restrained his assailant with very little and possibly no injury to the latter. Doctor Karpman is a good Christian so far as practicing the Golden Rule is concerned, although he is not a believer in God or in religion as we understand it. And for this very reason the patient who attacked him might well be thankful, because, if Dr. Karpman believed in God after the fashion of Boston College, he would set aside his Christianity and "defend himself" with the "use of physical force against his unjust aggressor." It seems to me that a drink-crazed or mentally unbalanced person has enough to contend with without being subjected to muscular Christianity.

This question of insanity reminds one of the claim so often made during the World War that the Kaiser was insane and we had to use physical force to restrain him. Well, in the first place the Kaiser was not fighting us, it was a game of the international profiteers and the Kaiser was one of their pawns. In turn the Kaiser had other pawns. If the Kaiser was insane, his subjects -- many of whom were Catholics -- were obeying the edicts of a mad-man instead of obeying the commands of God, and the priests and bishops were exhorting the populace to follow the lead of this lunatic. Too, the lunatic was not restrained; only the sane people who followed the leadership of the lunatic were restrained, some with injury and some with death. The Kaiser, however, goes about with his limbs intact, his health unimpaired and plenty of "jack" to keep the wolf from the door. Assuming that the Kaiser actually was insane, there is less excuse than ever for having permitted him to drag us into war. Surely the millions in America could join hands with the millions in Germany and together these many millions of sane persons ought to be able to handle one insane man. Or were all the Germans crazy? Hardly, for that would include the clergy. There must have been a goodly number of sane people in Germany during the war, and it is a very simple matter to gain mastery over a sane mind if you use the weapons of God. God can overcome the insane as easily as He can the sane, so even if all the Germans were insane -- which only an insane person would claim -- Christ's rule "overcome evil with good" would work just the same.

Lines 40 to 43 of Boston College's argument: "The thesis proves the right of self-defence, not the duty. One may forego the exercise of a right, but it may be one's duty for extrinsic reasons to exercise this right." Since the extrinsic reasons that Boston College had in mind are not stated, I will be unable to answer them in particular. In general, however, extrinsic reasons cannot alter the course of a Christian's inherent duty, for if they were permitted so to do, expediency would supplant principle. It is the substitution of expediency for principle because of "extrinsic reasons" that precipitates war, and once the war is on its way the same process of reasoning

is used in the justification of further wrongs. Father Macksey declared that it was not right to kill prisoners of war. Yet, in the grim stress of reality, those in charge of operations often ignore this rule. Quite recently I was talking to a Catholic youth who had participated in the four greatest battles of the World War, a man whose honesty I have reason to believe equals his courage. He told how time and again they killed prisoners. One instance was particularly startling. Thirteen Germans were being marched from the battlefield to prison. One of them stubbed his toe, disturbed the line, the officer in charge ordered all of them shot on the spot, thirteen Germans were quickly filled with sufficient lead to banish all of this world's worries. No doubt the officer who issued the order for this execution felt that he was fully justified. He may have been wondering all along whether he should not have executed them in the trenches instead of taking the trouble to bring them to prison. Possibly he reasoned that bothering with those prisoners was so interfering with the efficiency of his fighting unit at that particular time that it might mean the loss of 13 Americans. Whatever were his particular notions, we may feel reasonably certain that for "extrinsic reasons" he believed it his duty to exercise the questioned right of executing prisoners because the defense of the country at this "auspicious moment" warranted such action.

Lines 51 and 52: "nor may one inflict injury in anticipation of the fact of aggression."

Answer: Granting that this is the fact in the case of an individual, why does it not hold good in the case of groups of individuals? When a pacifist indicates the error of war, the militarist asks: "What would you do if somebody attacked your wife?" This is an attempt on the part of the militarist to draw a parallel between individual and national conflict. If the parallel were justified in one direction, it would be in the reverse of that direction. I agree with the statement of Boston College that one may not "inflict injury in anticipation of the fact of aggression." Yet, that is exactly what nations do in the case of war! Anticipating aggression, the United States sent a few million young men more than 2,000 miles from our shores in order to "inflict injury" sufficient to destroy the possibility of the anticipated aggression becoming a reality. "If we do not help to crush Germany, she will attack us next," was the excuse given by American people for entering the war. Using the logic of the militarist referred to just previously, if an individual is not permitted to inflict injury in anticipation of the fact of aggression, then the nation or group of individuals is not allowed to do so.

Lines 53 to 58: "In the use of self-defence, one might be the cause of the loss of the soul of the aggressor, -- not per se, but per accidens, and the one attacked has not the duty in charity in preventing this evil, because the aggressor is not in the condition of extreme necessity of losing his soul, since the danger he is in can be escaped by desisting from aggression."

Answer: I maintain that, in the instance just cited by Boston College, the one attacked is weighted down by an extraordinary duty. Ordinarily, it would be his duty to overcome evil with good -- to desist from using physical weapons for the infliction of injury or restraint -- but in the case where the one who attacks is in mortal sin and you know that your defense with physical weapons is liable to cause his death -- in fact, Boston College says that if necessary you may cause his death -- you are in this instance violating God's law of love thy neighbor and, in addition, plunging a soul into hell. So valuable is one's soul that Christ asked: "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world but suffer the loss of his soul?" On the ground that the aggressor can escape the danger of losing his soul by desisting from his attack upon you, Boston College justifies you in hurling his soul into the infernal regions for all eternity in order that you may protect life, limb, or property in a manner that has been condemned by God. Even if God permitted us to thus safeguard life and property, it seems that ordinary humanity would be sufficient to deter one from exercising his prerogative in the hypothetical case just instanced by Boston College.

According to Boston College's argument, a man in mortal sin on the battlefield is "not in the condition of extreme necessity of losing his soul, since the danger he is in can be escaped by desisting from aggression." This is not their argument, but it is the logic of it. And I will agree with it. But if the aggressor in battle desists from his aggression, he would be adding sin to sin according to Father Macksey, for it is his duty to engage in the war that his country has told him is a "just war." Going or coming, the unfortunate soldier who happens to be in mortal sin is in an awful plight! I suppose the remedy is to avoid mortal sin. But temptations that beset a soldier are so powerful that they overcome thousands, and those thousands reluctantly go into battle -- and die. This one reason would be sufficient to keep me from taking part in war: I do not know whether the man or men whom I aim to kill and in all probability will kill, are in mortal sin or the state of grace. If the former, then I have been instrumental in sending a soul to hell for all eternity. Boston College would salve my conscience by assuring me that the lost soul could have escaped damnation by either keeping in the state of grace or staying out of battle when in mortal sin. But the lost soul succumbed to temptation, as nearly all of us do at some time or times in our life, and he lacked the courage to refuse to fight. One in mortal sin has not the spiritual advantages of one whose soul is pleasing to God, and if I happen to be in the happy state of presenting a less offensive appearance before the Almighty then I may more easily muster enough courage to stay out of the conflict, and I could thus avoid causing one or more souls to dwell in the infernal regions for all eternity. Under these circumstances, I believe that God would forgive me the sin of refusing to battle with physical weapons against an imaginary enemy. In individual or national life, the way to make certain that we will not cause a soul to dwell in hell is to overcome evil with good.

Lines 59 to 65 which conclude the thesis: "Nor is one obliged to forego self-defence, if the aggressor be crazy or drunk, because this obligation would exist only when three conditions are present: if (a) the aggressor is certainly in mortal sin. (b) there exists a well-founded hope of freeing him therefrom. (c) it is morally certain that the one attacked is in the state of grace. Conditions seldom or never verified in practice."

Answer: The maniac or the drunkard has the same opportunity that Boston College guarantees in lines 53 to 58, viz: he can escape the danger of losing his soul by desisting from aggression. I suppose though, the theory contained in lines 59 to 65 is based upon the assumption that the psychotic or inebriate lack the reasoning power essential to volitionally desisting from aggression. And, in that case, if the aggressor is certainly in mortal sin, and if there exists a well-founded hope of freeing him therefrom and it is morally certain that the one attacked is in the state of grace, then the one attacked is obliged to forego self-defense, but not otherwise. Boston College concludes: "Conditions seldom or never verified in practice." Quite true, because how am I to determine whether a crazy man is in mortal sin? If I listen to his story and believe him, he will convince me that he is God Almighty, spotless, just, wise, good, in fact possessing all the attributes of the Divinity. The drunkard is oftentimes possessed of the same delusions. There is no way for me to learn positively whether my assailant is in mortal sin, and, since he is crazy or drunk, I do not know nor can I determine whether there is any future hope of freeing him from mortal sin even though I do know for certain that his soul is stained with deadly guilt. The only safe course for me to pursue is to forego self-defense; that is, forego the kind of self-defense advocated by Boston College and use the kind of self-defense prescribed by Christ.

In lines 53 to 58, Boston College allows you to defend yourself against the aggressor even to the taking of his life as stated in line 2, provided that the aggressor is sane; even though he be in mortal sin, you are allowed to kill him according to lines 53 to 58. But, if the aggressor be in mortal sin and insane or intoxicated, you must let him kill you according to lines 59 to 65. If you are going to attack anybody while you are in mortal sin, it would pay you to first go crazy or get drunk. Think of it: the sane man who attacks me, who would be more likely to respond to Christ's remedy of returning good for evil since he is able to reason, I am allowed to slay. But the insane man, who could not comprehend my Christian proposals and my good example, and who is the most likely to be overcome by physical force if physical force is ever justified, must be allowed to kill me if the conditions stated in sub-paragraphs a, b, c, exist. The absurdity of such reasoning makes it clearer than ever that man's finite judgment is not to be depended upon. Play safe and follow Christ!

Summing up the argument of Boston College, one has a right to defend himself or his neighbor or his limbs or his property against an unjust aggressor. It would be difficult to define who

is a "just" aggressor. Aggressors ought to organize and get Father Macksey to write a treatise on "just aggression." Most, if not all aggressors, believe that their aggression is justified, same as in the case of wars, each side thinks that its war is just. The point that struck home in Boston College's argument was that it always dealt with unjust aggression, the defending of one self from an unjust attack. Father Macksey's treatise on war pursued the opposite course; it dealt with "just" wars. In a way though, Father Macksey's and Boston College's arguments are identical, because a "just war" is waged in defense against an "unjust aggressor" and the individual action of self-defense is made against an individual "unjust aggressor," according to the position of Father Macksey and Boston College. But, if Father Macksey's mode of argument were pursued, i.e., establishing a line of justification for the prosecution of a "just war," then the argument of Boston College would have to defend the aggressor on the ground of "just aggression" instead of defending the defender on the ground of self-defense against "unjust aggression." Or, suppose Father Macksey pursued Boston College's mode of argument and justified a nation engaging in war purely in self-defense against an unjust aggressor? This would be calamity! This would brand one of the participants as an "unjust aggressor" from the very beginning, and that would ruin the game of war, because if the situation is analyzed it develops that each nation that begins a war is an "unjust aggressor" although it claims that its offensive war is for defensive purposes. Boston College does not grant the individual this right, but Father Macksey delegates such right to the nation. It is wrong and unnecessary for an individual to use physical force in an attack upon another individual, for there are always other and better ways of settling the issue involved, and, as a last appeal, all other means having failed, there is Christ's remedy of forgiving injuries and meekly bearing whatever injustice is involved; God will balance the account and reward you an hundred fold for loyalty to Him. The same is true of groups of individuals called the State or the Nation. On the other hand, it is wrong and unnecessary for an individual to "use physical force against an unjust aggressor, even to the point of taking his life," for there are always other and better ways of defending oneself, and, as a last appeal, all other means having failed, there is Christ's remedy of resisting not evil, forgiving injuries and meekly bearing whatever injustice is heaped upon one; God will balance the account and reward one an hundred fold for loyalty to Him. The same is true of groups of individuals called the State or the Nation.

One more point on this self-defense argument: I have been in prison for more than two years. How could I defend my wife and child and my widowed-mother while I was separated from them by thousands of miles? After my wife moved to the home of her folks, my dear, old mother was alone; circumstances made it necessary for my wife to move, so that she could be close to the work that she was doing for her father. For months mother was alone, not a soul in the house with her at night, and during the day she was alone excepting during the time that visitors called. Now, suppose my mother was attacked? How could I defend her? I

was securely locked in prison miles away! Ah! There is a way, and, under the circumstances it is the only way that I can defend her. And I have defended her in just that manner, and am now defending her and will continue to defend her by appeals to God our Father. Now, if I defend her in that manner when I am separated from her, why not do so in case she is attacked while I am in her presence? If I have enough faith to trust in God's power while I am away from home, I ought to trust in Him when I am at home! And, when at home, my trust in Him is supplemented by works, for I could then use personal entreaties in connection with my appeals to God, I would become a transmitter of God's word to my mother's assailant.

Traveling salesmen are away from home for weeks and sometimes for months. If they can trust God to protect their loved ones during that period, why not trust Him when they are at home? Even when living at home and working in our home city constantly, we are separated from our loved ones almost half of each 24 hours. If we can trust God during one-half of a day, why not trust Him the other half? God can protect our dear ones just as easily and just as successfully when we are near them as He can when we are away from them. "Unless the Lord keep the house, they labor in vain who keep it." -- Psalms. Since God can and does protect individuals, He can and will protect nations if we will allow Him to do so in place of interfering with His plan by using Satan's weapons. "Unless the Lord keep the city (and the same is true of nations) they watch in vain who keep it." -- Psalms 126: 1. God can and does defend individuals and groups of individuals from famine and pestilence, but while we recognize His power and His goodness in protecting us from these aggressors, we fear that He is powerless when it comes to protecting an individual or a nation against man's aggression.

Now, taking another step backwards, I will present the case of Homicide. Quoting from volume seven of the Catholic Encyclopedia, article written by Father Joseph F. Delany: "In conformity with the Thomistic doctrine is the axiomatic utterance that a private individual may never lawfully kill anyone whatever, because in self-defense one does not, technically speaking, kill, but only endeavors to stop the trespasser. Hence, according to the Angelic Doctor, it would follow that only by due operation of law may a human being ever be directly done to death."

Answer, I will consider the last part of the statement first. It states that "technically speaking" one does not kill. Well, the person killed is just as dead as if he were killed technically. I admit that one's motive determines one's guilt or innocence, but there is another factor, which if not properly considered, will discount the purity of one's motive. If my motive is love for my neighbor and I use evil means to accomplish the good end, then I am defeating my objective. God might excuse me on the ground of ignorance, but when His law is so plainly and so frequently stated in the New Testament, I could not expect much mercy on the assumption that I did not know what was wrong. I know a case where a young man defended himself against assault, struck

his intended assailant three blows on the point of the jaw, and the latter died within twenty minutes. The one who defended himself is now serving a life term in prison. I believe that this young man was unjustly dealt with, and I hope to be able some day to assist him by informing certain persons about certain facts. But tonight he is behind the bars with a life sentence hanging over him. According to Boston College, he did exactly the right thing, but man's justice sometimes miscarries. The court that tried Fisher seemed to assume that he erred in defending himself, and in some respects the court was right, although the members of that court -- every one of them -- were believers in the use of physical force for defensive purposes, and, with that belief as a ground-work, they should have acquitted Fisher. Fisher is suffering because of a mistake. If man punishes so severely for a mistake, will God's justice entirely overlook the mistake that one makes in using evil weapons to accomplish a good end?

The aforementioned quotation on Homicide reads in part: "Only by due operation of law may a human being ever be directly done to death." In this little phrase is contained the entire substance of Homicide, Killing in Self-Defense, Capital Punishment, and War. I will repeat the quotation: "Only by due operation of law may a human being ever be directly done to death." Using this as a premise, it follows that Homicide is prohibited. Then taking the question of self-defense, it follows that, according to Father Delany's statement, one may only endeavor to stop the trespasser, but is not permitted to intend the killing of the trespasser. I have previously dealt with the hazard of resorting to physical force in stopping a trespasser, showing how it does sometimes result in death; and I have also instanced why it is wrong to use physical force even in stopping a trespasser although the stoppage does not result in his death. So, we may now consider capital punishment and war together with regards the declaration that "only by due operation of law may a human being ever be directly done to death." I am going to requote certain words of Christ. So much repetition is exasperating, but it is in this case necessary, and, after all, Christ's words are so sublime, so instructive, so inspiring that we should never tire of writing, reading, or speaking them. In Matthew 7:12: "All things therefore whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them. For this is the law and the prophets. Enter ye in at the narrow gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there are who go in thereat. How narrow is the gate, and strait is the way that leadeth to life: and few there are that find it!"

The foregoing quotation from Christ is the Golden Rule that we once before considered. But, at the time of consideration, Father Delany's statement on Homicide was not at hand. We observed in the study of capital punishment that, one condemned to death receives a commutation to life imprisonment joyfully. I am not now arguing in favor of life imprisonment, but recalling that it is preferable to the death penalty, for life imprisonment does not always mean life imprisonment, as there is some chance of getting out

before one dies, and I believe you will agree that all normal persons will choose life imprisonment in preference to death. That being the case, if you or I were condemned to death, we would welcome a change in sentence; in other words, we would prefer to not be sentenced to death if the sentence is going to be executed. Now, Christ says that it is "the law" to treat others as we wish to be treated. Regarding war, we observed that war is a bad thing, that we do not like it, that we prefer that people refrain from warring upon us. That being the case, then, regardless of what others do or fail to do, it is our duty to act toward them as we wish to have them act towards us; in other words, we should not war upon them. Christ did not include any ifs or ands, He merely stated that we should do unto others as we wish to be done by, and He assured us that if we followed His rule of life, He would take care of everything for us.

Having discussed the various "killing" phases of life, I am now back to the question of war again, which will be pursued to the limit of my time for presenting this statement of the C.O. philosophy.

We agreed with Father Delany's statement that "only by due operation of law may a human being ever be directly done to death." War directly does people to death. Now, if this is contrary to "due operation of law" then it is wrong. And, if it is wrong, we should not take part in the wrong and therefore America should disarm in order to avoid the occasion of sin. The question now to be decided is: What is the law? From what Christ has told us in the reference just previously cited, the Law is to do unto others as we wish to be done by. Since we prefer peace to war, we must live in peace with others. We cannot dodge the issue by saying that since they do this we must do that. Christ asks: "Do you want other people to love you, to do only good things to you, to live in peace with you?" You answer: "Yes." That answer determines your conduct toward others, and what the others do beforehand or afterwards or during the time of your rendering good unto them, has nothing to do with the matter. According to your statement of how you wish other people to conduct themselves toward you, you must treat them with love, do only good things to them, and live in peace with them, regardless of how they act toward you. What is true of individuals is true of nations. So, America disarm!

There is conflict between the law of the land and the law of God, judging from what has been brought out. So how is this conflict to be resolved? Sufficient evidence has been introduced by Catholic authorities to prove that in cases of conflict, the Law of God takes precedence. We will now consider some additional evidence on the wrongfulness of war.

As a part of his argument on the question of Homicide, Father Delany declared: "Thus, for instance, a military commander may train his guns upon a fortified place, even though in the bombardment which follows he knows perfectly well that many non-combatants

will perish. The sufficient cause in the case is consideration of the highest public good to be subserved by the defeat of the enemy." Here again we find that the original wrong-doing finds excuses for continued wrongs. Something on the order of telling a lie; you have to tell a dozen other lies to cover up the first one. Father Delany said that it is sinful to kill an unoffending, innocent person. But, in the case of war, he permits the killing of thousands of innocents, many of whom no doubt were in sympathy with the aim of the enemy but not in accord with the means pursued to accomplish the end. On the pretext of "public good to be subserved" you may slaughter as many as you wish. Does Father Delany justify the German military commander's siege of Liege? Germany believed that the bombardment of Liege and the sequential killing of thousands of innocent non-combatants "subserved the highest good." But, as a matter of fact, was it for the public good? Who is to correct these errors? The Catholic clergy of Germany supported Germany in the war, which means that they condoned the besieging of the Belgian stronghold, while the Allies viewed the attack as one of the blackest crimes in history. If the Germans won the war, it would be claimed that their cause was just, and that they therefore were right in all that was done within the limits of warfare defined by Father Macksey. Germany lost though, and the loser has not got many defenders of his policy. Still, Father Delany's statement, if true, would excuse Germany's assaults upon the strongholds of Belgium and the incidental killing of innocent non-combatants.

The Germans killed thousands of innocents in Verdun, because, according to Father Delany, it was a case of subserving the highest public good. At least that is what Germany thought. Every move, on each side of the conflict, is considered by the military commander as essential to the highest public good. Manifestly, it is contrary to God's law, for even according to Fathers Macksey and Delany it is sinful to kill the innocent, although these priests attach a safety-clutch to every restraint upon killing so that it will be permissible in case of "necessity" for those in "authority" to kill as many as will be required to "subserve the public good" regardless of the guiltlessness of those slain. And the innocent are no safer on one side of the combat than on the other, for both sides are fighting a "just war" and the military commanders on both sides are not going to let the pleas of the innocent interfere with victory at an "auspicious moment."

This killing of the innocent affords some justification for the question of the militarists: "What would you do if somebody attacked your home?" And then they assure you: "That is just what the enemy is doing, attacking all of our homes!" The difference between individual attack and national attack is that the one who attacks you individually is generally motivated by a grievance either fancied or real, and you have some opportunity to make amends or explain matters to the individual, thus avoiding the necessity of taking his life or of injuring him. In the case of war, those making the attack have nothing against us, although some of the soldiers finally become convinced by false accounts that we are their enemies. Generally, however, the fact that they must be

conscripted into attacking us is proof that they do not want to harm us. True, many want to avoid being harmed themselves, but thousands who were offered safety-first places refused to accept them, and other thousands reluctantly joined the colors. On the whole, few of them really want to become a part of the undertaking. One cannot make amends or explain to these thousands of soldiers as one would do to an individual attacking him, but, by following Christ's rule of "resist not evil" which, as interpreted by St. Paul, means to "overcome evil with good," then the time would come before long when you could explain to all that were making the attack and easily persuade them that you were their friends and not their enemies. But the slaughter process cuts off an opportunity to explain anything to them. Consequently, they slaughter the innocent on your side of the fence and you slaughter the innocent on their side of the fence. The assertion that the innocent must suffer with the guilty will not excuse violation of the command to not kill. Perhaps you will contend that if you do not resist you will be annihilated, your country laid waste, its citizens killed and wounded and taken captive. Well, better that than offend God, for God will be on the job for a long time after that happens and if His promises are true He will balance accounts in a manner most favorable to those who remained loyal to Him. But, consider it from a rather practical viewpoint: Seldom does a man attack an unoffending child. The man is here represented by an army ready to attack; the child is represented as a nation following Christ's warning to become as little children. Human instinct would restrain the intending attackers so effectively that all the commands of their officers would come to naught. You will remember the case of Devault in Leadville, he was perhaps the only man in Leadville who didn't carry a pistol, he was surrounded on all sides by friends and foes armed to the teeth, sometimes the friends would turn foes and sometimes the foes would become friends, but regardless of life's storms he always went around unarmed, and he settled every problem amicably. What he did, every individual can do; what every individual can do, a nation can do. America can disarm, and like Daniel in the Lions' Den she would be at ease and uninjured for the lions surrounding her in the form of other nations with armies and navies could not overpower or set at naught the mystical power of the Almighty.

I would now like to quote various passages from the Knights of Columbus' prayer book -- the one quoted from some time back -- and, after quoting the passage, make certain observations of my own anent the relevancy of the passage to war. I will not refer to the page of the prayer book, as I am going to cite several quotations from pages 33 to 63, not including those previously referred to. I hope that my remarks will not seem caustic. Whatever I write is for purposes of enlightenment, and I would regret offending those whom I am trying to lead out of temptation. My remarks about the Knights of Columbus might be misconstrued, hence this apology. The members and the officers of the K. of C. are noble, unselfish, sincere souls striving to aid their fellow men, and because they, like, millions of others, have chosen through lack of vision a method destructive of the ends they

seek to attain, is no reason for denouncing them. I do censure their methods -- that is, whatever of their actions tended to support the war, but not their welfare work, which was really a genuine service to those aided. Indirectly, their welfare work aided the war, but when I praise the welfare work I do so not in the sense that I approve indirect aiding of the war, but in the light of honest appreciation of their good intentions. I admire, for instance, the spirit of those soldiers who honestly believed that they were doing the right thing in going to war, but my admiration of their heroism and their unselfish sacrifices does not mean that I praise the work of slaying their neighbors.

The first item that I wish to comment upon from the Catholic prayer book distributed among soldiers and sailors by the Knights of Columbus is a part of the "Examination of Conscience" which examination is suggested preparatory to Confession. One question is: "Have I injured my neighbor; wished him ill or sought revenge?" If you have not injured your neighbor, you are going to if you stay in the army or the navy. Question number two of those that I wish to quote reads: "Have I led others into temptation?" You certainly have, and are continuing to do so; you are tempting men to commit murder. Get out of the army and preach Christianity by example to your fellow citizens and those in authority over you. Question number three: "Have I given scandal?" Yes, you are teaching others, both old and young, the bad example of participation in a game that is rotten with sin. Question four: "Have I provoked quarrels?" Not exactly; the profiteers provoke the quarrels and you serve as cannon fodder. Still, you are an accessory, for without you to depend on the profiteers would not stir up international quarrels. Question five: "Have I been brutal to animals?" Worse than that; you have been and will be, in the game of war, brutal to those animals whom God elevated to His own image and likeness.

I have asked the questions as they appear in the prayer book, and I have answered them as if my conscience were accusing me, supposing, of course, that I were a soldier.

Page 36: "Let thy grace, O Lord, ever precede and follow us and make us continually intent upon good works." I'll have to get out of the army if I am going to do good works, and if I do not get out of it, it is hypocrisy to say the prayer just quoted.

Page 38: "Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God of armies!" Our divine Lord is not the Lord of military armies, for, if He were, He would treat each side impartially. If God is the God of military armies, why is it that the side mostly in the right often loses? If He is the God of military armies, why does He bless England's Satanic deeds with centuries of success? If He is the God of armies, do you think that He favored the Von Hindenburg Line? If He did not favor Von Hindenburg, then He was taking sides with the enemy. A God of armies would not play favorites, and He would see to it that His armies kept on the side of right so that

He would not have to line up with its opponent. A God of armies -- I am of course speaking all the time of military armies -- would make it known just which side was fighting a "just war" and not leave it to both sides to "think" that they were fighting a "just war," for, as it is, one side is wrong and committing murder on all battlefronts every day; this statement is supposing of course that one side is actually justified, which it is not; but, if it were, the other side would be in the wrong, and there is only one God to be distributed among all these armies; so how is it that an All-Wise and an All-Righteous God lines up with Satan? Clearly, the God of armies is a God of spiritual armies, of heavenly armies, whose armies are opposed to the armies of Satan, which comprise the worldly type known as the army and navy.

Page 38: "Adorable Jesus, divine model of that perfection to which we should all aspire, I will endeavor to follow Thy example, to be mild, humble, chaste, zealous, patient, charitable and resigned. Incline my heart to keep Thy commandments. I am resolved to watch over myself with the greatest diligence; to live soberly, justly and piously for the time to come. Enlighten my mind, purify my heart and guide my steps that I may pass all my life in Thy divine service. Amen."

Comment: "Divine model of that perfection to which we should all aspire!" I have quoted the Model's admonitions of perfection in previous chapters, a casual perusal of which is sufficient to convince anybody that such recommendations are contrary to the philosophy of war. "Mild, humble, chaste, patient, charitable." Nothing like that in war! One of the commandments is to not kill. Does one "live piously" in war? If I am going to pass all my life in the divine service of God, then it is necessary to sever relations with things military, for "no man can serve two masters." If God answers the foregoing prayer and enlightens the mind, purifies the heart and guides the steps, there will be harmony in one's life, in place of the discord that we witness today. In playing a violin, the musician carefully reproduces the notes that he is reading; but suppose that he played the opposite of each note that he read and continued thusly throughout the selection that he was rendering? One would have to listen to such discordant tunes in order to fully realize their dissonancy. In the music of life, we play the opposite tune every time that we deviate from the path outlined by the "Model of perfection." Let us take a lesson from the army: Suppose the general in command ordered a retreat, but, in transmitting the order, his aide-de-camp inadvertently passed the order on to his subalterns as a command to advance. The army walks into the jaws of death and is all but annihilated! Many thousands are needlessly slain because of the mistake of one person. Just what happens in the battle of life. God's order reads to overcome evil with good. His aide-de-camps -- those who serve as mentors for the masses -- pass the order on as one to overcome evil with evil, and catastrophe visits the souls and bodies of millions.

Page 47 contains the litany of the Most Holy Name of

Jesus and among the invocations are: 1. Jesus, Sun of Justice; 2. Jesus, God of Peace; 3. Jesus, Author of Life; 4. Jesus, our Refuge; 5. Jesus, Eternal Wisdom; 6. Jesus, our Way and our Life; 7. From the neglect of Thy inspirations, Jesus, deliver us. I will now comment on each one. No-1: Since He is the Sun of Justice, why not allow His rays to dispel the darkness of iniquity instead of trying to eliminate injustice ourselves? You might reply that heaven helps those who help themselves. But, we should not help ourselves or attempt to help ourselves by using wrong weapons. If one is ill, he does not help himself by taking poison. The army and navy act as poison for the ills of humanity, and the history of the world is one continuous story of suffering mankind being made more miserable by the poison of war. If occasionally it would cure, there would be a slight excuse for using it, but the few instances in the world's history which seem to have justified resort to arms -- such as the American revolution and the civil war -- only seem to justify our disobedience of God's laws and in no way do they prove that God's method patiently and thoroughly applied would not have eventuated more blessedly than the tactics adopted. No-2: Since Jesus is the God of Peace, why insult Him by linking His holy name with war? No-3: Since Jesus is the Author of Life, we ought to cling to Him, and thereby obtain life here and hereafter; the war game is sponsored by the author of death, brings death to us here and hereafter. No-4: Jesus, our Refuge! What a blasphemy to seek refuge in the strong arm of the military! No-5: Why not follow the Eternal Wisdom of Jesus, in place of pinning our faith to the folly of man? The words of Jesus are plain enough. Read the fifth chapter of Matthew, then ask yourself the question that I asked Jack Kelly, viz: "Does it sound like a war doctrine or an anti-war doctrine? No-6: Yes, Jesus is our Way and our Life, and if we follow Him after the fashion outlined in the Epistle of St. James the Apostle, we will be living the spirit of that plea voiced in the aforementioned citation which is numbered seven, viz: "From the neglect of Thy inspirations, Jesus, deliver us."

Page 49: "O Lord Jesus Christ, Who hast said: Ask, and ye shall receive; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you; grant, we beseech Thee, unto us who ask, the gift of Thy most divine love, that with all our hearts, words, and works we may ever love Thee, and never cease to praise Thee."

Comment: Life is such that, it is impossible for us to love and to serve God unless we love and serve His children. The one whom we consider an enemy is loved by God perhaps more than you or I are loved. In any event, God loves all His children, and He made it clear that it is our duty to love His children, for He told us that the second and greatest commandment covers this very point. In warring upon our neighbor, do we love him with all our hearts, words and works? I cannot read the hearts of men, except as their thoughts are reflected in words, and actions. The printed and spoken words of the fighters and those that support the fighters in time of war, are an eloquent testimony to the hatred the war engenders. Nor are ministers of the gospel, preaching from God's altars, very much outdone in expressions of hate. Many of them are

quite charitable, but many others forget this Christian duty.

There is a feeling that deserves the term "just hatred," and it belongs in the category of "just war." Father Delany did not refer to it as "just hatred," but his description tends to permit a certain kind of hatred, and I believe that war-Christians base their authority to hate upon Father Delany's philosophy. On page 149 of the Catholic Encyclopedia, volume eight, we read the following in the article on Hatred from the pen of Father Delany, the same priest who wrote the treatise on Homicide; I will number each line:

1 "Hatred in general is a vehement aversion entertained by one
2 person for another, or for something more or less identi-
3 fied with that other. Theologians commonly mention two
4 distinct species of this passion. One (odium abominationis,
5 or loathing) is that in which the intense dislike is con-
6 centrated primarily on the qualities or attributes of a
7 person, and only secondarily, and as it were derivatively,
8 upon the person himself. The second sort (odium inimicitice,
9 or hostility) aims directly at the person, indulges a
10 propensity to see what is evil and unlovable in him, feels a
11 fierce satisfaction at anything tending to his discredit,
12 and is keenly desirous that his lot may be an unmixedly hard
13 one, either in general or in this or that specified way.
14 This kind of hatred, as involving a very direct and absolute
15 violation of the precept of charity, is always sinful and may
16 be grievously so. The first-named species of hatred, in so
17 far as it implies the reprobation of what is actually evil,
18 is not a sin and may even represent a virtuous temper of
19 soul. In other words, not only may I, but I even ought to
20 hate what is contrary to the moral law. Furthermore, one
21 may without sin go so far in the detestation of wrong-doing
22 as to wish that which for its perpetrator is a very well-
23 defined evil, yet under another aspect is a much more signal
24 good. For instance, it would be lawful to pray for the death
25 of a perniciously active heresiarch with a view to putting a
26 stop to his ravages among the Christian people. Of course,
27 it is clear that this apparent zeal must not be an excuse for
28 catering to personal spite or party rancor."

If Father Delany's article on hatred accords with Christianity, then it is a simple matter to extend his domain of hate from praying for one's death to that of actually killing the one whose sin is so hateful that the sinner should be put out of the way "for the common good." So, before proceeding, we must examine this question of hate.

Since the second class of hatred referred to by Father Delany is admitted to be sinful, we need not consider it. It is the first class of hatred that becomes the subject of inquiry. Lines 16 to 19 read: "The first-named species of hatred, in so far as it implies the reprobation of what is actually evil, is not a sin and may even represent a virtuous

temper of soul. In other words, not only may I, but I even ought to hate what is contrary to the moral law." Agreed! That is why the C.O. hates war, that is why he hates killing of all kinds, but we are dealing now particularly with war.

Lines 20 to 26 read: "Furthermore, one may without sin go so far in the detestation of wrong-doing as to wish that which for its perpetrator is a very well-defined evil, yet under another aspect is a much more signal good. For instance, it would be lawful to pray for the death of a perniciously active heresiarch with a view to putting a stop to his ravages among the Christian people." Here is where the ship of Christianity, as I view it, strikes a rock. All admit that an "unjust war" is wrong-doing. I am compelled to use the term "unjust war" because I am viewing the situation from the side of the nation that is attacked, for instance, America in the World War. America was not attacked, but she feared that she would be if she did not get busy, and America felt that America's participation in the war was a "just war," while that of her opponent was an "unjust war." So, "unjust war" is wrong-doing. Now, a "much more signal good" would be a cessation of this "unjust war." And the way to put a stop to the "unjust war" is to either dissuade its participants with Christ's weapon of love, or resort to the use of physical force even to the extent of killing. It is the latter method that comes within the purview of a "very well-defined evil" mentioned in the quotation from Father Delany just cited. I claim that wishing this "very well-defined evil" for the perpetrator is a sin, and a very grievous sin, for if the wish is gratified it deprives a person of his life which is man's most cherished treasure. All those who indirectly aid war, are manifesting a wish for the death of those on the opposite side of the conflict, even though the indirect aid consists in nothing more than verbal approbation. Christ said that any man who looks upon a woman with lust in his heart, commits adultery in his heart. The same holds true of those wishing the death of another, for it is only a matter of circumstance that prevents the taking of that other's life. Too, the verbal support of the one who actually does the killing, may be the last straw that broke the back of opposition in his conscience and resulted in acquiescence; whereas, if there had been verbal opposition in place of verbal support of his act, he would have succeeded in restraining himself. Cases in point are hundreds of C.O.s who were talked into joining the army; in some cases friends talked them into it, in other cases relatives and friends, in other cases relatives and friends and army officials.

Now, the statement: "For instance, it would be lawful to pray for the death of a perniciously active heresiarch with a view to putting a stop to his ravages among the Christian people." If this is true, then, if the infidel had a God to pray to, he could lawfully pray for the death of a perniciously active Christian with a view to putting a stop to his ravages among the unbelievers. The defect seems to inhere in the

fact that the infidel has no God to pray to rather than in the fact that praying for another's death is sinful; such would seem to be the logic of Father Delany. In the matter of hate, this situation gives the Christian an advantage over the infidel. Perhaps the infidel will balance accounts by learning to love in place of hating. Incidentally, this would be a good example to set the Christian, and it appears that the Christian is sorely in need of such an example.

We can hate what is contrary to the moral law without ever allowing that hate to affix itself to the person or persons violating the moral law. For example, I hate my unjust imprisonment, not only because it discommodes me, but also because it is an evil, and an evil is no respecter of persons. The evil that I have been suffering from for more than two years has made itself felt by many others beside myself. I should concentrate my energies upon banishing unjust imprisonment from society, and this concentration does not allow any of my hatred to become attached to the individuals responsible for the evil. For those responsible for the evil of my unjust imprisonment, I must, as a Christian, entertain the same love as that that I feel for my neighbor in general. In fact, I love many of my persecutors more than I love my neighbor in general, for I have come in close contact with these persecutors and have been able to observe many commendable traits of character in them.

Yes, we should hate the evil of war. But we should love those who war upon us. And the way to enlighten our persecutors, the manner in which to dispel the cloud of darkness that enshrouds those who take part in war, is to pray for their welfare rather than for their death. Not only should we pray for their welfare, but also we should combine works with faith and do things that will benefit them. In short, we should aid them by thought, word and deed. "Overcome evil with good."

Cardinal Logue, primate of Ireland, denounced the shooting of Constable Brennan who was assassinated at Dundalk a few weeks ago presumably by Sinn Feiners; and at the same time he upbraided England for its reprisals in Ireland. Referring to Brennan, however, the Cardinal said: "The poor victim I know to have been a quiet, upright man who never gave offense to any one in the discharge of his duty. Am I to be told that this is an act of war; that it is lawful to shoot at sight any one wearing a policeman's uniform and honestly discharging a policeman's duty? I prefer to call it by its true name -- cold, deliberate, willful murder. Hence, any one who plans, encourages, abets, or even sympathizes with such an act participates in the guilt before God." According to Cardinal Logue, to pray for the death of such as Brennan would be to participate in the crime of murder. Which conclusion, in the light of the gospels, is flawless. But let us consider the matter from the viewpoint of a "just war" as the animal is called by Father Macksey. And, as a preliminary, we will observe the remainder of Cardinal Logue's letter which stated: "I know we are living under the harsh, tyrannical

regime of militarism and brute force, which invites and stimulates crime; that all pretense of discipline has been thrown to the winds; that those professing to be the guardians of law and order have become the most ardent votaries of lawlessness and disorder; that they have been overrunning the country and making the night hideous by raids, rifle fire, burnings and the destruction of valuable property; that towns have been sacked, as in the rude warfare of the earlier ages; that those who run from fear are shot at sight; and that reckless firing in crowded places has made many innocent victims. And when these things are reported to the authorities, either investigation is refused or some hole or corner inquiry held. But we have never heard of punishment. All this professes to be done by way of reprisals, but reprisals are generally unjust and often fall on the innocent. Crime does not excuse crime."

An election was held under British auspices, and Ireland voted for an independent republic, a president was duly elected, the new Irish government began to function. Brennan was an English policeman; he had no right on Irish soil. They tolerated him for a while, and then "bumped him off." Chances are that his life was spared longer than it would have been spared in America had he assumed the role of policeman in one of the American cities and was afforded the protection of English soldiers who unlawfully invaded our territory. These facts, however, are somewhat irrelevant. The point is: Ireland and England are in a state of virtual warfare. The foreign government of England is attempting to function in Ireland against the wishes of the Irish. If Father Macksey's justification of a "just war" is justified, then the Sinn Fein were justified in assassinating Brennan. Cardinal Logue, however, takes the proper view of the situation in his concluding remarks: "Crime does not excuse crime."

English authorities and pro-English persons are wishing for the death of the Irish government in Ireland, which if it is to die can only die after the death of many who uphold it. Which means that England wishes the death of many Irishmen. On the other hand, Irish authorities and pro-Irish persons are wishing for the death of the unlawful English government in Ireland, which, if it is to die can only die after the death of many like Brennan who uphold it; even Lloyd George²¹ might be included in the death list. Which means that Ireland wishes the death of many Englishmen. When I refer to "England" and "Ireland" wishing the death of Irishmen and Englishmen, I of course mean by "England" those who support England's policy, and by "Ireland" those who support Ireland's policy. Now, according to Father Delany, it would be lawful to pray for the death of a perniciously active Englishman with a view to putting a stop to his ravages among the Irish people. Cardinal Logue comes along though, and says that to even sympathize with such an act as killing a perniciously active Englishman with a view to putting a stop to his ravages among the Irish people, is to participate before God in the commission of willful murder.

The facts support the assertion that Constable Brennan was a perniciously active Englishman. Admitting that, as Cardinal Logue said, he was "a quiet, upright man who never gave offense to any one in the discharge of his duty," that does not excuse him for undertaking the kind of duty that he was performing. Understand, I do not say that the Sinn Feiners did the right thing in killing Brennan; fact is, I declare that they did the wrong thing. But, viewing the situation through the eyes of the Sinn Feiners, they were simply performing their duty in getting rid of one whose pernicious activities menaced the lives of their citizens. Considered from the Christian standpoint, both Sinn Feiners and Englishmen are doing the right thing. If either or both sides would do what is right, then the statement that I made a while ago would not be true, i.e., instead of the English government in Ireland dying only after the death of many like Brennan, the English government in Ireland would die without the Sinn Feiners killing anybody.

Consider the heroism of Lord Mayor McSwiney²², who is dying in an English prison rather than eat the food of the outlaw Englishmen. This is the 26th day of his hunger strike, and, according to the morning papers, he is at the point of death. The New York Call relates that, according to McSwiney's wife, the Lord Mayor is opposed to any reprisals upon the persons responsible for his imprisonment. "When I die," said McSwiney, "ask my friends to not attempt retaliation upon the persons responsible. We want to show America that Irishmen are just." Such is the Christian spirit, and it will do more to aid Ireland than the course pursued by many Sinn Feiners. Let us hate institutions, but not individuals. Any institution that is contrary to the moral law deserves our hatred. But even this hatred of institutions is liable to lead us astray unless we keep it within certain limits, which limits are different in each individual case. The individual must not allow himself to so hate a thing that he is crippled in what would otherwise be a successful attempt to right it. I dislike the term "hate." We ought to avoid using it except for purposes of denoting the opposite of love. A friend of mine once told me that there is only one thing in this world that he hated, and that one thing is hate. How can one hate hatred? The very act of hating hatred is an act of hate. When we think of an institution -- an evil -- that we are wont to despise, let us concentrate upon its replacement by the right thing. This is a more constructive frame of mind, it is of the nature of love -- positive; whereas hate is negative.

On page 50 of the Knights of Columbus prayer book we read: "Comforter of the afflicted, pray for us. Queen of Peace, pray for us." These words are addressed to the Blessed Mother of God. How does Mary comfort the afflicted? Surely not with cannon! And bear in mind that the "afflicted" includes not only the one who prays for Mary's help, but also millions who do not pray to her. Comforter of the afflicted! Yes, the Mother of God is the comforter of the afflicted, but how is she going to

comfort the afflicted if we still further afflict the afflicted? through her Son, the Mother of God is powerful, but just as God cannot save the willful sinner, neither can Mary comfort the afflicted if we willfully interpose with cannon ball and poison gas. Remember that the evil of war is not confined to the guilty combatants; it also afflicts the innocent non-combatants. If we are going to be practical and sincere in our request that Mary comfort the afflicted, then let us join her army and enlist under the banner of the "Queen of Peace." Armies and navies never have, and because of their nature cannot, bring peace into the world, much less preserve it. So, if we are going to be loyal soldiers of the Queen of Peace, our duty is clear.

Page 52 quotes the Fifth Commandment: "Thou shalt not kill."

Page 53 contains this prayer to Anima Christi²³: "From the malicious enemy defend me!" The Soul of Christ will defend us from the malicious enemy, provided we do not ask Him to dwell in a heart that entertains Satan's ambassadors. Christ warned us that a house divided against itself shall fall, so how can we expect Him to take up His abode in our hearts and defend us from the enemy when we have drawn up a contract with the powers of darkness to use evil weapons for defense. No use trying, we cannot carry water on both shoulders.

A prayer to St. Joseph on page 53 reads: "Glorious St. Joseph, model of all who are devoted to labor, obtain for me the grace to work ... with order, peace, moderation, and patience, without recoiling before weariness or difficulties -- to work, above all, with purity of intention, and with detachment from self, always having death before my eyes and the account which I must render of time lost, talents wasted, good omitted, of vain complacency in success, so fatal to the work of God." A beautiful prayer! But why pick on St. Joseph? We asked God to help us, then we asked His holy Mother, and then we threw both overboard, and now we importune St. Joseph. The prayer would be praiseworthy and efficacious if we were going to live according to its spirit. Lip worship avails nothing. If I asked the doctor for a dose of medicine, and at the same time insisted on putting a bullet into my heart and causing instant death, how could the doctor help me? The prayer just mentioned asks for grace to work with order, peace, moderation, and patience. That does not sound like an order to mobilize! Of course military preparation against war is pursued with order, peace, moderation, and patience, but once the diplomats sign the death warrant for millions of innocents, then the order of military preparation gives way to the hysterical disorder of angry nations, the tranquility of peace is supplanted by the fury of war, and the "excesses of War" referred to by Father Macksey take the place of the moderation that we implore of St. Joseph, while the patient pursuit of peaceful undertakings is cast into the discard that we may be able to impatiently and intolerantly crush the enemy. In order that we may be able to honestly recite

that prayer to St. Joseph we should at every opportunity urge America's disarmament.

John W. Fihelly is a reserve officer in the American army, a splendid chap, a good Christian. Fihelly asked me: "Suppose we waited for God to feed us?" A perfectly good question. If we expect God to defend us, then we ought to expect Him to feed us. As a matter of fact, He does feed us, unless we go on a hunger strike and refuse to eat His food. If God does not feed us, I would like to know where we get our food! He has ships sailing to and from all parts of the world in order to supply us with variety; He furnishes us, through nature's laws, with the incentive to work; and, when artificial obstructions are not interposed by man, we enjoy the work necessary to enable us to produce various of life's necessaries for both home consumption and to exchange for the products that heavily-laden vessels bring into port. through instincts that He has implanted within us, and through the work of others of His children, God does feed us. And, if we permit Him to do so, He will defend us in the same manner. Since our instinct animates us to eat, why not steal the food? Because God said to not steal, and having forbidden us to steal, He has provided other ways for procuring food. Since our instinct animates us to defend ourselves, why not maintain an army and a navy? Because God said to not kill, and having forbidden us to kill, He has provided other ways for defending ourselves. We can work for our food or we can steal it. We can work for our defense or we can steal it. Maintaining an army and navy is like stealing our defense, for those institutions rob people of their lives, just as we would rob them of their lives if we stole their food and caused them to starve to death. We defend ourselves against the elements by providing clothes and shelter, but not at the cost of directly killing human beings as is done in war. "Give us this day our daily bread" is the prayer that brings us food. But the bread consists of much more than the one article of food; it consists, among other things, of defense. But, with an army and navy to defend us, we ought to change the prayer to read: "Give us this day our daily bread; you can leave the defense part out Lord, because we've got the best army and navy in the world."

Charles T. Hallinan, Secretary of the American Union Against Militarism, informs us that Section 69 of The Wadsworth Army Re-organization Bill provides for conscription of all males between eighteen and forty-five whenever a national emergency is declared to exist. According to a letter that Dr. Hallinan sent to The World Tomorrow a few months ago, the military training provision of the bill will not be considered until after the coming election. After election, the politicians will be safe to make America safe against Christianity. Foundations for a new war are being laid stealthily, without protest from the followers of Christ -- not entirely without protest -- but the protest is yet faint. Good Christians like Mr. Fihelly are honestly, yet mistakenly, supporting these moves for a new war by upholding the idea of muscular Christianity for defensive purposes. If Satan's efforts to militarize America are to be defeated, Christians must

quickly begin to practice Christianity.

Mr. Fihelly said that it is human nature to defend ourselves. True. There is also a Divine element. And, if our defense is in accord with the Divine nature, the human nature will be well defended. If, however, the defense is according to the human instincts, the Divine will be sadly neglected and the human will learn another human lesson.

In his "Will Guns Settle It?," Prof. Scott Nearing²⁴ speaks of the issue thusly: "Great issues beset the world on every side. The disposition of the Saar Valley; German East Africa; the Berlin to Bagdad Railroad; the oil wells at Tampico; Chinese trade; the independence of Ireland; the defense of the Russian Revolution; the solution of the Balkan question; the struggle for internal control in Germany; the conflict between labor and capital in all of the capitalist nations, -- these are some of the unsolved problems. All of which spell conflict, war, ultimate chaos, unless they can be settled and settled right!" All those in any way associated with what Scott Nearing mentioned are thinking of defense. Scott Nearing asks if violence is the way out. Then he reviews violence in the suppression of ideas, violence in the care of the insane, violence to stop crime, violence in the labor movement, and international violence. Nearing concludes that guns will not settle any of these questions, and that even when used for a good purpose guns lead to a bad end. And he pleads for "the institution of the dear love of comrades," as Walt Whitman expressed it. I believe that I am correct when I state that Nearing is not an orthodox Christian. I never asked him whether he believed that Christ is God, but I have observed that he reacts to everything in a thoroughly Christian manner. If those who do not profess belief in the divinity of Christ can make a success of practicing Christianity, it seems that such as my good friend Fihelly and all other Christians could do so. If I am not mistaken, Scott Nearing is what we term a materialist. Like thousands of materialists though, he deals with his fellow men more Christianly than the Christians do.

About two weeks ago, Hon. James Hamilton Lewis²⁵, former U.S. Senator, in a speech before the American Bar Association in St. Louis declared that another world war would be fought within four years. Lewis claims that the revenge of Germany, the vengeance of Russia and Oriental hatred of Japan will assail the supremacy of the United States to destroy it. Such an attack upon America would give Christianity the greatest impetus that it has had since the days of Jesus, if we would prepare ourselves to return good for evil. We should avoid the occasions of sin. In the days when rum was King, if the habitual drunkard did not remain away from the saloon, he was quite certain not to lose his reputation. Militarism is still King in the gay, old world, and if America does not stay out of the saloon she will again become intoxicated with war. Makes little difference who is elected president so far as war is concerned; we have war under

all kinds of presidents, and it will so continue until the Christians in America assert their Christianity and request disarmament.

You have Mr. Fihelly professing to believe in Christ's divinity, but failing to practice His teachings so far as our international neighbors are concerned. On the other hand, you have Prof. Nearing professing to not believe in Christ's divinity, yet dealing with international neighbors according to Christ's proposal. In the event that Senator Lewis' prophecy or something similar to it comes true, could Jesus count on the Fihellys who recognize His Divinity, or would He have to seek the company of the Nearings who think of Him as a mere man?

On page 54 of the K.C. prayer book: "Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct the deliberations of Congress and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government; so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, etc." Again and again is God appealed to for peace, all the while we prepare for war. On page 60 there are some short ejaculatory prayers, two of which read: "It is Almighty God Who girdeth me with strength. The Lord is my strength, and my praise, and He is become salvation to me." Yes, God girdeth us with strength, and the strength of God does not need reinforcements from the army and the navy whose weapons He has condemned.

A week ago Sunday, I again was blessed with the privilege of attending Mass. And again Father Diekamp preached, taking for his text the Epistle of the Sunday which was read from the fifth chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians as follows: "I say then, walk in the spirit, and you shall not fulfill the lusts of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the spirit: and the spirit against the flesh; for these are contrary, one to another: so that you do not the things that you would. But if you are led by the spirit, you are not under the law. Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are fornication, uncleanness, immodesty, luxury, idolatry, witchcrafts, enmities, contentions, emulations, wraths, quarrels, dissensions, sects, envies, murders, drunkenness, revelings, and such like. Of the which I foretell you, as I have foretold to you, that they who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God. But the fruit of the Spirit is, charity, joy, peace, patience, benignity, goodness, longanimity, mildness, faith, modesty, continency, chastity. Against such, there is no law. And they that are Christ's have crucified their flesh, with the vices and concupiscences. If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit. Let us not be made desirous of vainglory, provoking one another, envying one another."

Father Diekamp then read the Gospel of the Sunday, which was taken from the sixth chapter of Matthew dealing with "No man can serve two masters." It is plain from what St. Paul said that the Master militarism is associated with enmities, contentions, wraths, quarrels, dissensions, envies, murders; because Paul speaks of the other Master in this manner: charity, joy, peace, benignity, goodness, mildness, faith; and we know that these latter states are

not the product of armies and navies. "Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?" -- Matt. 7:16.

In the course of his sermon, Father Diekamp warned how human inclinations lead one astray. He instanced Luther and Henry VIII, both of whom at one time were good Catholics. The story of their lives is too well known to need repetition, but we may consider the result of their fall: they caused millions to be led away from Truth. They did not do as badly in their particular fields however, as the Catholic hierarchy is doing in the field of militarism. Yes, Luther and Henry were also militarists. I want to point out tho: by its support of things military, the Catholic hierarchy are today doing more harm to Christianity than Luther and Henry did, because the two latter named at least started another branch of the Christian Church and instilled some Christianity into the hearts and minds of those whom they reached. While the Catholics, by supporting military affairs, are closing the door of Christianity to hundreds of millions of benighted creatures throughout the world. Viewing the muscular type of Christianity that we preach, the unenlightened pray to whatever God they know that they may be spared from such a vicious type of civilization. I admit that other Christians are doing perhaps as much as the Catholics to perpetuate this unchristian form of Christianity, but charity begins at home, so I must not criticize those of other beliefs while the Church that I belong to is so wicked in the matter under consideration. Luther and Henry did wrong, but we are doing a greater wrong. If we would "about face" it is quite likely that the good example would help those whom Luther and Henry have drawn from the true fold.

Father Diekamp concluded his sermon with an exhortation to "hope, and trust God in all things." The spirit of this exhortation is repeated thousands of times in Catholic literature and in sermons throughout the year. In spite of all, we put our trust in the army and navy, incidentally causing the death of millions and the maiming of other millions in addition to the disease of body and mind that is visited on hundreds of millions of non-combatants.

Page 61 of the K.C. prayer book refers us to verse 8 of chapter 1 of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, and quotes the words of that verse as follows: - "though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a Gospel to you other than that which we have preached, let him be anathema." The gospel of militarism is the very opposite of that that St. Paul preached.

On page 62, in response to the question "How are you to find out the true Religion?" the prayer book states: "You must truly and heartily repent of all the sins you have committed; you must have no other wish than to learn the will of God and to do it; you must be resolved that neither persecutions nor losses, nor worldly interest, nor anything else whatsoever, shall prevent you from doing the will of God, when you know what that will is; and you must often pray that He will teach you His holy will, saying: 'What will you have me do?'" If you follow this advice, you may be sure that God will hear your prayer and lead you into the "right way." Read that statement over two or three times, and

as you read it ask yourself what bearing it has upon the teachings of Christ as quoted in previous pages; ask yourself whether that statement in the army and navy prayer book of the Knights of Columbus does not make it clear that, no matter what the cost, a Christian should advocate America's disarmament. To practice the true religion, one must necessarily live in harmony with those precepts that the God of Truth has had recorded in the New Testament.

The great trouble with us is that we are too practical. I mean by this that we consider almost everything in life from the so-called practical viewpoint. Consequently, we feel the need of something that we can see -- a battleship for instance -- in order to be certain of protection. Our attempt to be practical renders us less practical, not because the end is harmful but because the means that we adopt are inherently destructive of the end sought. An example will illustrate: In the insane asylum where I am confined, the guards are not allowed to abuse the patients. The rule is sometimes violated, but as a general standard it is adhered to quite closely under the present administration; at least such has been the fact since I came here a few days more than a month ago. Naturally my observations have not extended over the period of my incarceration; but I have noticed ever since coming here that the "no brutality" rule has been obeyed quite commendably. And, mark you, - I am in the worst section of the insane asylum -- the ward for the criminally insane. If brutality is necessary any place, it is necessary here. But it is not necessary any place. As a result of the "no brutality" rule, the handling of these insane prisoners closely approximates the ideal if such is not actually attained. There was a time, in years past, in this and other institutions, that it was considered imperative to use physical violence in handling the class of people that I am now so closely associated with. Lessons in human nature have taught differently. Nor is brutality necessary in handling international offenders who are criminally insane. The time will come when those who advocate military preparation for peace will be locked-up to prevent their harming themselves and others; when they are cured of the mania, they will be restored to civilian status the same as recovered patients are now restored. Meantime we will consider a "Prayer For All In Trouble" which appears on page 63 of the K.C. prayer book and reads:

"Most Blessed Virgin, in your life of glory, remember the sorrows of earth. Look with kindness on those who suffer, who struggle against difficulties, who drink unceasingly the bitternesses of this life. Have pity on those who love each other and are separated. Have pity on the lonely of heart. Have pity on the weakness of our faith. Have pity on the objects of our affection. Have pity on those who weep, those who pray, those who fear. Obtain for all, hope and peace. Amen."

Seems to me that we ought to have pity on the Mother of God, and not subject her to the ridiculous plight of obtaining peace for us from her loving Son and then see us shatter that peace with shrapnel. Then, adding insult to injury, we dictate a message something like the one that follows which General Pershing²⁶ telegraphed to the Commanding General of the Second Division in France: "Allow me to extend my warmest congratulations upon the splendid spirit shown by

the 9th Infantry in recent encounter with the enemy, especially to those men who declined to accept their status as prisoners, but turned upon their captors and destroyed them and returned to their own lines." Major General Bundy²⁷, through his chief of staff Col. Preston Brown, appended the following to Pershing's order -- it is General Order No-28 -- "... The fact that they wounded, killed and took prisoners is sufficient proof of the fine spirit for offensive action possessed by our troops." Contrast these utterances of military authorities with the words of Christ found in the fifth chapter of Matthew wherein our Divine Lord beseeches us to not resist evil, to turn the other cheek, to go two miles with whomsoever forces us to go one mile, to love our enemies, and to do good to our enemies. And, after making comparisons, ask yourself if the Mother of God does not deserve to be pitied when we so fiendishly ignore her Son's entreaties. Asking the Mother of God to "obtain for all, hope and peace," and then to pursue a course destructive of these blessings, is on a par with asking God to give us food that our lives may be spared and then taking a dose of poison.

We ask Mary to "remember the sorrows of earth," and, fearing that she might forget, we add to the sorrows in order to keep her mind upon them. We ask her to "look with kindness on those who suffer," whereas a little kindness on our part would help matters greatly. We ask her to look with kindness on those "who struggle against difficulties," and at the same time we increase those difficulties. We ask her to look with kindness on those "who drink unceasingly the bitternesses of this life," and all the while we are adding to those bitternesses. We ask her to "have pity on those who love each other and are separated," yet we support a wholesale killing game that not only separates loved ones for a time but makes the separation lifelong. "Have pity on the lonely of heart," while we multiply the number of the lonely. The next quotation needs no comment: "Have pity on the weakness of our faith." Still, we might have a little pity on God's Mother and strengthen our faith by exercising it. If one did not take physical exercise one would soon die; if the brain is not exercised it will become abortive; and so it is with Faith -- if you do not keep it in trim by constant use, it will wither and die. Our faith in militarism is so strong that we appropriate increasingly large sums for its upkeep, despite the fact that it has failed again and again for thousands of years. If we would have faith enough in God to try His method with one-half the amount of perseverance that we have spent in the pursuit of Satan's scheme, we would be rendering a little practical aid to the Mother of God in attaining those ends sought when we utter that "Prayer For All In Trouble." This again brings to mind Fihelly's question: "Suppose we depended upon God to feed us?" We ask God for our daily bread, but at the same time we do His will in helping to get that daily bread. We work just the opposite in asking for peace and for protection, by praying for these things but opposing His Will in the matter of securing them. For instance, the Midvale Steel Company is one of the founders of the Navy League. According to Congressman Tavenner²⁸ -- former Congressman, I should have said, for it seems that the Christians defeated him for his opposition to militarism -- the

United States Government, from 1903 to 1915, bought from the Midvale Steel Company, 48,399 tons of armor at an average of \$420 a ton, the total amount being \$20,375,858 for the single item of armor plate alone. The U. S. Government bought \$39,783,497 worth of armor plate from the Carnegie Steel Company during the same period, according to Tavenner. And, the Carnegie Steel Company was in the control of the United States Steel Corporation, of which J. P. Morgan was the organizer and a director. Morgan was a founder of the Navy League. Tavenner informs us that, during the same period, we bought \$43,344,947 worth of armor plate from the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, of which Charles M. Schwab is president -- at least he was president the last that I knew of his public life -- and he also was one of the founders of the Navy League. We pray to God for peace, and at the same time found Navy Leagues -- or, which is just as bad, encourage their founding. Tavenner informs us: "Of the nineteen names in the list of founders of the Navy League the majority were connected with concerns and establishments which, through interlocking directorates, connect in turn with manufacturers of war materials and things which go into war materials." The American government is spending somewhere in the neighborhood of a billion dollars annually for its Navy, the Catholic hierarchy favors this expenditure else they would oppose it, and the poor people of the nation are asked to foot the bill which they meekly do while chanting the prayer "Most Blessed Virgin ... obtain for all hope and peace." There is food for thought in Grace Isabel Colbron's poem entitled "The Ballad of Bethlehem Steel" which originally appeared in the Public. It reads:

A fort is taken, the papers say,
Five thousand dead in the murderous deal.
A victory? No, just another grim day: -
But -- up to five hundred goes Bethlehem Steel.

A whisper, a rumor, one knows not where;
A sign, a prayer from a torn heart rent;
A murmur of Peace on the death-laden air,
But -- Bethlehem Steel drops thirty per cent.

"We'll fight to the death," the diplomats cry.
"We'll fight to the death," sigh the weary men.
As the battle roars to shuddering sky,
And -- Bethlehem Steel has a rise of ten.

What matters the loss of a million men?
What matters the waste of blossoming lands?
The children's cry or the women's pain?
If Bethlehem Steel at six hundred stands?

And so we must join in the slaughter-mill,
We must arm ourselves for a senseless hate,
We must waste our youths in the murder drill --
That Bethlehem Steel may hold its state.

What a blasphemy to name this Corporation after the city in which Christ was born! Yet, if it engaged in constructive

rather than destructive work, it would merit the name, for Christ came "that we might have life and have it more abundantly."²⁹

There is a little edition of the Catholic Bible distributed by The National Catholic War Council, Washington, D.C., called the Army and Navy Edition of the New Testament. I have been favored with a copy of this New Testament from which I have quoted the words of Christ, as you have read them in the preceding pages. In the front part of the little book, is a statement entitled "Foreword" and addressed by Cardinal Gibbons³⁰ to the Soldiers and Sailors of the United States. The "Foreword" is too long to quote in its entirety, but I wish to quote part of it and to number the lines:

1 "Our Blessed Lord is a model unto all men, at all
2 times and under all conditions of existence. Hence, the study
3 of His character, as sketched in these pages (The New Testament)
4 will be to you a never-failing source of instruction and comfort.
5 Called by the President, as the Commander-in-Chief of the forces
6 of the nation, to the service of your country, love for its soil
7 and for its people must necessarily be the mainspring of all your
8 military activities. In these respects, Christ Our Lord is your
9 example. He loved His native land, for He sanctified it by His
10 presence; He consecrated it in His Precious Blood; and He
11 illustrated it by the glory of His Resurrection. He loved His
12 people. Was it not to them that He first offered the priceless
13 blessings of His Gospel? . . . Respect for authority is
14 of the very essence of military life, order and efficiency. It
15 is plain, then, that your first and most important duty is prompt
16 and cheerful obedience to the commands of your superiors. The
17 sanction for it is found in these words of the New Testament: 'Let
18 every soul be subject to the higher powers; for there is no power
19 but from God; and those that are, are ordained of God . . .
20 Wherefore be subject of necessity, not only for wrath, but also
21 for conscience' sake. ''

If what Cardinal Gibbons said is true, then I deserve to be excommunicated from the Catholic Church, and it has served me right to be sentenced to prison for refusing to respond to the call of the Commander-in-Chief. Let us examine Cardinal Gibbons' statement, not only in the light of Holy Scripture, but also as compared with some statements contained in a little book entitled "Maxims of Cardinal Gibbons." I have been trying for four weeks to get this little book of Maxims, and I finally got it today. It is filled with anti-war statements, and I had hoped to quote all of them, but my time is getting short, so a few citations must suffice.

Lines 1 to 4 in Cardinal Gibbons' "Foreword" of the army and navy edition of the Bible, tell us that "Our Blessed Lord is a model unto all men, at all times and under all conditions of existence." Thus far we agree. In his Maxims the Cardinal says: "The Holy Scripture is your weapon in time of war, and your companion in time of peace." Fine! Just what I always thought. Right here I might digress long enough to tell how I first became acquainted with Cardinal Gibbons Maxims. With other conscientious objectors, I was

in prison at Fort Douglas, Utah, at the time when Mrs. C. E. Allen of Salt Lake City brought us a supply of reading material, books, candy, fruit, etc. Mrs. Allen was a Good Angel to the C.O.s. Two of her sons were officers in the army during the World War, one of them was killed in action, and a post of the American Legion is named after him. So, Mrs. Allen knows something about the Mothers' side of war. Well, one of the books that she brought was Cardinal Gibbons' Maxims, although Mrs. Allen is not a Catholic. I read that little book -- I wish that everybody would read it -- and I wondered why I was in prison. Perhaps the inability to explain my imprisonment in the light of Cardinal Gibbons' Maxims is what unbalanced my mind and caused me to be sent to the insane asylum. For instance, one of his maxims reads: "How immense is the distance between God's treatment of a repentant sinner and man's conduct towards an offending brother!" I suppose though, the Cardinal wishes that we should not take that statement too seriously, else we might reflect how we tear to pieces the body of not a single offending brother but of millions of unoffending brothers who are only responding to the call of their Commander-in-Chief.

Lines 5 to 9 of the Cardinal's "Foreword" in the Bible read: "Called by the President, as the Commander-in-Chief of the forces of the nation, to the service of your country, love for its soil and for its people must necessarily be the mainspring of all your military activities. In these respects, Christ Our Lord is your example." Then in Cardinal Gibbons' Maxims we read: "Of all the "virtues that shine forth in the life of our Divine Saviour, there is none so prominent, none so conspicuous as His compassion for human suffering. On every leaf of the Gospel that golden word mercy shines forth, brightening, every page, cheering every heart." I challenge Cardinal Gibbons to produce the evidence that will show Christ to have been our example for serving our country with "military activities." We should serve our country, yes. Also, we are duty-bound to serve God. The exhortation "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's" is only stated in part by most militarists; appended to what I have just quoted are the words: "And unto God the things that are God's." Now, we should serve our country, but not in a manner that conflicts with God's laws and Christ's teachings. In the Cardinal's Maxims he has referred to Christ's compassion for human suffering. Did Christ ever express that compassion by increasing the amount of human suffering or by killing people? If not, then He was not an "example" for our youths in serving their country militarily. Christ's mercy was expressed by feeding the hungry, restoring sight to the blind, curing the sick. And, those same miracles can be worked today. At least it would be in the nature of a miracle if the money now spent for munitions, that result in hunger, sickness, and blindness, were diverted into channels of mercy and spent for food and the prevention of disease. Christ restored the sight to many, but for every instance recorded in the New Testament of His causing the blind to see, the World War produced at least 50 blind men. You perhaps observed the words in the section just quoted from lines 5 to 9, which read: "love for its (your country) soil and for its people." Our love should extend beyond the confines of America, and as Christians we must love those on foreign soil; we must love them more in time of war than in

time of peace, for when our neighbor is in sin or in trouble is the time when he most needs our love. We should not be balmy weather lovers. "It's easy enough to be pleasant when life goes on like a song; but the one worth while is the one with a smile when everything goes dead wrong," is a sentiment that, translated into scriptural terms would recite the fact that it is an easy thing to love our neighbor when he is not in need. But the love worthwhile is the love undefiled when the loved one becomes a foe.

Line 11: "He loved His people." Yes, all the people. Christ died for the redemption of mankind, not part, but all. And, He showed His love for mankind by dying for them in place of killing them. It is not recorded that He was even a stockholder in any war-munitions plant.

Lines 13 and 14: "Respect for authority is of the very essence of military life, order and efficiency." True. But the kind of order that military affairs produces is the kind that reigns in the graveyard. And, military efficiency is the destructive type, nothing constructive about it. Of course it is constructive in many ways, but all of its constructiveness is concentrated upon destruction. Christ's life was just the opposite, viz: destructiveness concentrated upon construction; destroying those institutions that destroy men in order that mankind "might have life and have it more abundantly." Now, while it is true that "respect for authority is of the very essence of military life," that does not mean that one should respect military authority. Military authority is an evil, according to the testimony of the Blameless One, and you will remember that Father Delany said that we should hate evil. The kind of authority to respect is that that is rightly constituted, viz: the authority of God and whatever authority man justifiably wields that does not conflict with God's laws.

Lines 14 to 16: "It is plain, then, that your first and most important duty is prompt and cheerful obedience to the commands of your superiors." Just the opposite, for you are speaking, Cardinal, of military superiors toward whom our first and most important duty is disobedience of commands, because to obey their orders would be to wound and kill our neighbor. You will say: "It is self-defense," but I have pointed out before that it is the wrong kind of self-defense and in the long run it does not defend that that the defender wishes to defend. It does, however, defend profiteers and the evil associated with manufacturing munitions of war. One of your Maxims reads: "Never do you approach nearer to God than when you alleviate the sorrows of others. Never do you prove yourselves to be the children of your Heavenly Father more effectually than when you bring sunshine to hearts darkened by the clouds of adversity. Never do you perform a deed more like to the creative act of the Almighty than when you cause the flowers of joy and gladness to bloom in souls that were desolate and barren before." Beautiful! But all of these military affairs not only do not do, but in addition they effect the reverse of conditions that you have portrayed.

Lines 16 to 21 quote what purports to be the sanction for obeying military commands. They read: "The sanction for it (obedience to military superiors) is found in these words of the New Testament: 'Let every soul be subject to the higher powers; for there is no power but from God; and those that are, are ordained of God . . . Wherefore be subject of necessity, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake.'" These words are taken from the 13th chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, verses 1 and 5. In verse 8 of the same chapter St. Paul tells us: "For he that loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the law." And, in the 9th verse he tells what we should avoid doing, mentioning among other things "Thou shalt not kill," and he concludes thusly: "And if there be any other commandment, it is comprised in this word, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." We do not love ourselves by dropping bombs from an airplane upon people in New York City or having our friends drop bombs upon us. Which means that we must not drop them upon people living in foreign cities. We do not love ourselves by having an army of our soldiers attack us; which means that we must not have our soldiers attack others. In the 10th verse of the same chapter of the same Epistle that Cardinal Gibbons called to his rescue, St. Paul tells us: "The love of our neighbor worketh no evil." An army worketh considerable evil. If I were to cheerfully obey the command of a military officer and cheerfully exercise a machine gun on several of the enemy, the enemy would not feel very cheerful about it. If Cardinal Gibbons is not slightly off on his logic, then I belong in the insane asylum, for the way I figure things out is: Given a machine gun, an enemy to train it on, and the command of an officer to fire, I can work considerably more evil upon that enemy's body than I would enjoy having worked upon me. Since I would not take kindly to that sort of love, I should not force it upon another. There is no contradiction between the first part of chapter 13 and the latter part. St. Paul's doctrine is in complete harmony. "The higher powers" that he exhorted us to be subject to are not military powers, for military powers are "lower powers" being associated with things Satanic. Moreover, as pointed out before, it is evident that St. Paul was referring to the ministers of the gospel when he referred to the powers that are being ordained of God; a careful reading of the first four verses in chapter thirteen will bear me out in this. Where St. Paul speaks of God's minister bearing not the sword in vain -- as he states in verse 4 -- it is plain that he does not mean the kind of sword that Peter was using when Christ rebuked him, but the "sword of the Spirit" which St. Paul speaks about so forcefully in his Epistle to the Ephesians.

Having briefly pointed out the Christian inconsistency of Cardinal Gibbons' "Foreword" printed in the army and navy edition of the Bible, we will now consider a statement in his Maxims that accords with the spirit of his Foreword. It reads: "Every one in lawful command, whether he be civil magistrate, or military officer, or employer, is clothed with Divine authority and is God's representative. In submitting to those set over you, you are obeying not man, but God. It is this principle that ennobles obedience; for obedience is not an act of servility to man but of homage to God."

Answer: Cardinal Gibbons refers to those in "lawful command, whether civil magistrate, or military officer, etc." The command of a military officer is unlawful for the reasons stated in all that has been said before. There is no such animal as lawful military authority, because things military conflict with God's laws, and whatever conflicts with Divine Authority is nugatory according to Father Macksey's essay on Church and State. According to the Cardinal, the Dominicans -- including Archbishop Nouel -- are disobeying God, for they are not submitting to those set over them. The military government in Santo Domingo was "set over" the Dominicans by U.S. officials for the good of the Dominicans. The Dominicans, however, seem to not appreciate the iron heel and they have refused to submit to America's autocracy. The Cardinal says: "In submitting to those set over you, you are obeying not man, but God." Then the American government was established by act of disobedience toward God, for George Washington and his followers did not submit to England's rule. This very day Ireland is, according to the Cardinal, disobeying God, for England was "set over" Ireland and Ireland should submit. If the Cardinal's logic is correct, then Terence McSwiney is committing suicide, for he is today dying in Brixton prison on the 28th day of his hunger strike, refusing to eat Britain's bread because Britain is an outlaw government and has no right to imprison Ireland's Lord Mayor of Cork. To eat the bread of Britain would be to inferentially acknowledge England's sovereignty in Ireland, which Lord Mayor McSwiney as a loyal Irishman cannot do and be true to his oath of office. According to the Cardinal, Jesus Christ did not obey God for He disobeyed the Roman authorities and preached a doctrine proscribed by the Romans, a doctrine that threatened the very existence of the Roman Empire. If "in submitting to those set over you, you are obeying not man, but God," then, Jesus should have submitted to the laws of the pagans and ordered His life in harmony with Roman jurisprudence. We should obey those set over us when they are right, and when they are wrong we should disobey them. It is a simple matter to determine what is right and what is wrong, for the pages of the New Testament are replete with lucid expositions of God's holy Law.

Many Catholics are naturally perplexed by the fact that the Pope has not ex cathedrally forbidden participation in war. It must also be borne in mind that he has not ex cathedrally ordered participation. Consequently, the matter is still an open question. I have a faith that someday the Pope will officially declare that the command to not kill means to not kill. One of Cardinal Gibbons' Maxims reads: "A new decree of faith which the Church formulates from time to time does not imply a fresh doctrine superadded to her creed, but rather emphasizes and vindicates an old dogma, because it happened to be called in question. The new decree develops and brings into light a truth that was implicitly contained in the deposit of revelation."

The next, and I believe the last, witness to be introduced is The National Catholic War Council (N.C.W.C.). In its official monthly bulletin published in Washington, D.C., it gives an explanation of the meaning of the seal of the Council, which consists

of a circle with a cross in the center. The explanation reads: "The Cross: The symbol of faith in right, in justice; the symbol of Him who died for truth and right and justice. The symbol of the faith that is the spring and inspiration of doing for others according to justice and love. The Circle: The symbol of service; all-embracing; equally dispensing its labor, its enfolding strength, to all without end; the symbol of enduring, complete service to all."

That explanation would be O.K. for a National Catholic Peace Council but it hardly fits a War Council. I will indicate by numbers the points symbolized and will then examine those symbols to see if War has a just title to them. 1: Faith in right; 2: Faith in justice; 3: The symbol of Him who died for truth and right and justice; 4: The symbol of service, according to justice and love; 5: An all-embracing symbol; 6: The symbol of enduring, complete service to all.

Symbol No-1: Faith in right. Then why not do what is right? One of Cardinal Gibbons' Maxims reads: "St. James, the Apostle, says: 'Whoever shall keep the whole law, yet offend in one thing is guilty of all' for the observance of the others will not avail him unto salvation. Now God demands the homage of our intellect as well as of our will, and as we displease the God of holiness by keeping all the law, but offending in one point, so we displease the God of truth by accepting all the truths of revelations, but rejecting one." St. James told us some other things that it might be worthwhile to review before making comparisons. He told us to be doers of the word and not hearers only; he told us to not kill; he told us that faith without works is dead; he told us that we should love our neighbors as ourselves and he termed this the Royal Law. From previous observations we have learned what all this means. We have learned that we do not like to be loved by a thrust of bayonets, and therefore, we are prohibited from loving in that manner. The activities of The National Catholic War Council helped to cause the greasing of many thousands of bayonets with the crimson blood of those whom Christ would have bathed in the healing waters of kindness and mercy and love.

The question of what is right is one that absorbs the attention of many honest persons. In politics for instance, we have the reactionary, the conservative, the liberal, and the radical, with different shades of opinion at every little station along the line running between the two opposite poles of thought. Each person thinks that his opinion is right, and he is confident that, in time, the majority of the people will vindicate his policy by adopting it as their own. And so it is in every phase of life. Each person thinks that he is Right personified. I think it, you think it, all think it. Manifestly, a number of persons holding varied opinions concerning a given thing cannot all be right, for truth is oneness. Perhaps one in the group is right, perhaps all are wrong. Now, in the question of war, we need not rely on majority opinion; rather a minority of One is proof whether we are right or wrong. That One has presented Truth in such clear terms that there can be no mistake made in the application of it, unless the applier willfully errs.

I desire to reiterate that God did not contradict Himself, and if "overcome evil with good" can be understood to mean what is right according to Christ's doctrine, then "Faith in right," as The N.C.W.C. has expressed it, should impel them to withdraw their support from everything that tends to overcome evil with evil. War is an undisputed evil, so great an evil that we spend billions in money and lives to defend ourselves against it, and since it is an evil of such magnitude an attempt -- a Christian attempt -- should be made to gather together such a tremendous volume of forgiveness and kindness and love that the great evil of war will finally have met its doom. Evil can be conquered by Good for the simple reason that the Devil cannot withstand God; this is Greek to the Agnostic, but it ought to be understood by the clergy and laity composing the N.C.W.C.

Symbol No-2: Faith in justice. "Justice" takes in considerable territory. True, the Cross of our Divine Lord symbolizes Justice and everything else that is good, for He died that we might have good without limit. St. James tells us that "the fruit of justice is sown in peace," so I was wondering what right a War Council has to monkey with justice. Peace cannot be attained through the instrumentality of war, and therefore, according to St. James, the path of war does not lead to justice. The seed of war produces the kind of justice that Ireland, Egypt, India, and such nations got. I wonder if the N.C.W.C. ever heard of "military justice." In America? Visit Fort Leavenworth, see those former soldier lads living under the "iron rule," starved, beaten, murdered. They call all this by the dignified term of "discipline." Without institutions like Fort Leavenworth, the army could not exist because most of the soldiers would "go over the hill." As it is there are thousands of deserters, notwithstanding the fact that capture means a home like Fort Leavenworth. I spent eight months in that hellhole so I am not writing from hearsay. The military prison is the backbone of the army, because, to repeat, without it you could not maintain an army. When the virtual foundation of an institution is cruel, wicked, unjust, and vicious, then you cannot expect it to sustain justice, for justice is a heavy load, justice is too wise to trust itself to such weak supports. I should not, however, make derogatory remarks about Fort Leavenworth, because an insane person is hardly to be believed. So I would like to refer those interested to Winthrop D. Lane of The Survey staff and H. Austin Simons of The American Freedom Foundation, both of whom have written extensively on conditions at Fort Leavenworth. Since the N.C.W.C. believes in Justice, my previous suggestion holds good.

Symbol No-3: The Symbol of Him who died for truth and right and justice. Well, why not conform one's actions to such policies? We have just mentioned justice; truth is the Word of God, which condemns war in no uncertain terms; and right is not based upon the might of armies. Consider the logic of the war game: Might is right! England's misrule is not based upon right, but upon the might of her mighty fleet. The merciless crushing of France in '71 was not based upon right, but upon the might of German arms. The exploitation of the masses is not based upon right, but upon the might of capitalism and its allies. The crucifixion of Christ was not based upon right but upon the might of the Roman guard. The army

is always and everywhere used to crush what is right. Sometimes an army undertakes to fight for what is right, but a larger army soon subdues it. Longfellow's words ring true:

"Were half the power that fills the World with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts;
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals and forts."³¹

Symbol No-4: The symbol of service, according to justice and love. This matter of service reminds me of a confession that one of our leading citizens made in my presence some time ago. I prefer to not mention his name, because it may cause him trouble. Anyway, it is not necessary to mention his name, for his statement can be multiplied by hundreds of thousands with a little variation of place and circumstance. He was a rebel, facing a term of ten years in Siberia, so he left Russia thinking that he could do more good for humanity by being free. He graduated from a college in America; the years rolled on; he has done little -- at least little compared with what he would like to have done -- for the cause that is dear to his heart. He still hopes that some day he can serve, but he admits that he seems to be getting farther away from service. He summed up by saying that action counts for a great deal more than mere thoughts. Now, the N.C.W.C. no doubt thinks often about the sublimity of Christ's teachings, what a grand world it would be if they were applied, and they hope that some day they may be able to make a start. If they would begin right now and serve according to justice and love, there would be an immediate change. As St. Paul said: "The love of our neighbor worketh no evil." One of Cardinal Gibbons' Maxims reads: "If I were asked what is the underlying principle of the Gospel, what is the essential characteristic of the religion of Jesus Christ, I would say, it is love." In another place the Cardinal says: "You will never be disloyal to a friend as long as you are loyal to Christ." Now, the people in America are our friends. In truth, everybody is a friend, but I want to speak in the language of the so-called patriots, so I will say that some Americans are our friends to whom we wish to be loyal. That we may be loyal we maintain an army and a navy and an air service, and we have a National Catholic War Council to keep alive the spirit of loyalty. Since according to Cardinal Gibbons, love is the essential characteristic of Christianity, it seems that we ought to practice it to the exclusion of whatever interferes with its expression. Since, according to St. Paul, the love of our neighbor worketh no evil, then, in order to be loyal to Christ and therefore loyal to our friends in America we must love our neighbor, which includes all those outside of America as well as within its borders. If the N.C.W.C. thinks that the maiming and killing of human beings is an expression of love for them, then by all means maim 'em and kill 'em. They believe, of course, that it is for the "common good." If such were the fact we would by this time have an immense surplus of "common good" because the "common gooders" have been at it for some thousands of years.

Symbol No-5: An all-embracing symbol, and symbol No-6: The symbol of enduring, complete service to all, clinch the argument against war. And if war is a bad thing, then the military

preparation, which brings it on, ought to be stamped out. "Complete service to all!" I wonder how The N.C.W.C. got hold of those words? They could get the words all right, but why did they assemble them in that fashion? Well, let us consider "complete service to all." Let us consider a few of the "all" with whom we must soon deal, for their problems are our problems. England, France, Germany, Ireland, Mexico, Japan, Russia, Poland, Holland, Belgium, Scandinavia, and Turkey are among the principal nations threatened with or actually going through a convulsion of revolutions. Within the last few days, Italy was added to the list. Revolution is inevitable, the question to determine is: shall it be a revolution of ideas or of bodies? Nicolai Lenin³² said: "It is with ideas, not with armies, we shall conquer the world." Then following the bad example of his Christian neighbors, he uses the army because, according to Father Macksey, it is "necessary." Why not set Russia and all the other nations an example of love? Archbishop Hayes³³ recently said in New York; "The Irish question is a world problem and it needs a world solution." The same is true of Russia, of all those nations that now grope in darkness. The loss of one cell in our body is a loss to the entire body; the loss of one person in society is a loss to society as a whole. You may say that a bad cell is a good riddance for the body. But I was referring to good cells, because in society there is no such thing as "bad." Every person is good, for he is made in the image and likeness of God. The capitalist will say that the bolshevik is bad and the bolshevik will say that the capitalist is bad, but both are good, every person is good. Evil ideas are bad, but the evil cannot be exterminated by killing people any more than good ideas can be blotted out by killing people. Since the loss of every person in society is a bad thing for society, we ought to prevent the great waste now going on, and thus will be rendered "complete service to all."

Some years ago, President Roosevelt sent a fleet of battleships around the world. You know why. Suppose we dismantled every battleship and transformed them into carriers of life's necessities. Then suppose that we diverted the money now appropriated for killing purposes into a fund for the purchase of food. Then suppose we loaded our former battleships with food and sent them on a trip around the world like Roosevelt did, with the exception that in place of exhibiting their man-killers they unloaded man-savers and distributed the food gratuitously to the needy in the various ports of the world. Which mission would Christ be most pleased with? The Roosevelt voyage of exhibitionism or the disarmament expedition of mercy? Whichever method would be most pleasing to Christ would be the most effective in safeguarding America from attack.

The airplane will soon make us England's next door neighbor, which in a way presages disaster. Distance has helped to save us from war -- although it did not save us from war with Germany -- but now distance will soon be eliminated. What a wonderful chance to set England an example that she lacks the courage to set the world herself? We need not bother about consequences; God will take care of tomorrow; the thing for us to do is to do what is right today, which means complete disarmament in order to render "complete service to all."

On my way from prison to the insane asylum, the Pullman Conductor took issue with my anti-military attitude and said: "How would your plan work in a city like Chicago or New York?" First of all, it is not my plan, it is Christ's plan and I am merely following the Master -- rather trying to follow Him, and I find that He gives one support. They have an army of police in Chicago, 5,000 of them; and they have an army of police in New York, 10,000 of them; but crime goes on merrily in both places. Oftentimes the police are the worst offenders. We have an army of police in Denver, yet murders and robberies are committed in broad daylight. You will say that the number of murders and robberies would be greater without the police. Not if all the Christians would practice Christianity, for, in the first place, there would be less need of robbery and murder if the Christians would live as Christians, and in the second instance the good example of God manifesting itself in the lives of the Christians could not be resisted by the evil inclinations of Satan attempting to find expression in the acts of temporarily abandoned creatures. To this you might reply: "When all the Christians start to live Christianly, then I will begin." If one waits for others he is liable to accompany them some day on a trip to that place that is paved with good intentions. Bernard Shaw proposed that the police be required to arrest every hungry child and feed it, and to arrest every naked child and clothe it. If this plan were applied to the grown-up children, it would prevent crime better than our present system of "move on."

Municipal police do not prevent municipal crimes, nor do international police in the form of armies and navies and airplanes prevent international crimes, although an international policing system substituting for the present system of mass slaughter would reduce the murders to a minimum. There is, however, no compromise between right and wrong, and the use of physical violence for maintaining order between Christians, would, in the event that Christians practiced Christianity, be less necessary than hiring family policemen to prevent little children who loved their brothers and sisters from tearing one another to pieces.

A friend of mine -- not a Christian, he is an Agnostic -- once told me of one of his experiences to prove how his philosophy of life worked out in practice. He said that he has always dissolved his enemies with kindness. This particular instance was a case where one of his fellow physicians at the hospital used to ask Dr. Jones to favor the former by taking his place. Jones favored Smith thusly on several occasions, much to Jones' discomfiture. Then Jones learned that Smith was violently prejudiced against him because of his nationality, and that he did not act kindly in Jones' absence. The natural thing to do would be to discontinue favoring Smith. Instead, Jones went out of his way to favor Smith, and from then on helped him more than ever at great inconvenience to himself. It's a long story. Smith's prejudice finally disappeared; he became a good friend and ardent admirer of Jones the Agnostic who, by his example, had overcome evil with good. What an individual can do, a nation can do.

Before summarizing the arguments that have been presented rather disjointedly, I would like to mention a few personal incidents that tend to throw light upon the manner in which nations should deal with nations. These personal experiences have been rather painful for others and for me, but I have learned valuable lessons from them. With a feeling of remorse, I have often reflected how I used to, years ago, engage in needless altercations with my dear old father who has long since, gone to his heavenly reward. We were good friends, I admired him, I gloried in his genius, but the fact that I was too intolerant of his opinions when in conflict with my ideas, acted as a barrier between us. I could hardly discuss any issue of importance with him without getting mad. Years of meditation -- not constant of course -- have impressed me with the need of Christ's condemnation of anger contained in Matthew 5:22³⁴. Anger is the beginning of the end. Just as it prevented me from properly understanding my good father, so it prevents nations from understanding one another. We should patiently consider the other fellow's views, and always strive toward the goal of meekness.

Misunderstandings are the principal causes of war. If we would try to know what other people are really thinking about, we would eventually learn that every person is just as good, just as honest, and just as wise as you or I. That is a broad statement, but it is true. Like ourselves, other people want to help their fellow men. Their method seems wrong, but give them a hearing. In one sense, Secretary Baker³⁵ is evil personified, but that is because I consider him from the viewpoint of my confinement and look upon him as the directing force of American militarism. Were I to know Baker's mind and heart as God knows them, it is quite likely that I would see therein a rich treasure of all that is good in humankind. Conflict of ideas cannot be resolved profitably except in the crucible of conciliatory discussion. If one must ultimately suffer an injustice, then that suffering can be endured to advantage provided it is undergone in a Christian spirit and for the sake of Christ. I repeat: What is true of individuals is true of nations.

While a prisoner in the Camp Dodge guardhouse, conditions were so intolerable that I made several attempts to interview the Commanding Officer, Col. Theo. Schultz. Every attempt was blocked by subalterns. Affairs grew worse daily, due to increased restrictions. Bad prison conditions were not really the fault of Col. Schultz, for he had only recently taken command. That, however, did not make life more bearable for the prisoners. The fact of our discomfort coupled with the impossibility of conveying the news to the proper official caused me to smuggle out letters exposing affairs. Two days after I had started the letters on their way, I was in the office of Col. Schultz and Major Townsend on other business. Had I known beforehand that I would be in their office, I would not have smuggled out the letters for two reasons: 1. I was really desirous of avoiding unnecessary trouble for the officials; 2. Smuggling out mail is not at all helpful for one's prison record. When talking to Schultz and Townsend on the day just mentioned, I was tempted to tell them just what I had complained of in the letters, but I refrained because first: I knew that if the letters got out -- and I was quite

certain that they did -- they would learn of the complaints very shortly; and, secondly: if I mentioned complaints at the time that I was talking to them, the complaints would distract attention from important matters then under consideration. So, right or wrong I kept quiet. In a couple of days things were sizzling. Col. Schultz would have remedied conditions without the pressure of exposure if one could have reached him with the facts, but efforts to reach him were fruitless. To this day, Schultz and Townsend believe that I was unfair to them. They had treated me kindly; they treated all the prisoners kindly. In fact, they were two of the most exceptional officers that I met in my prison experience. By "exceptional" I mean that they performed their duty with a maximum amount of humanity toward those under their care. It was not, however, until after the exposure that I came in contact with Col. Schultz and Major Townsend; rather, it was not until after I had sent the letters on their way. But, when I did meet these gentlemen I regretted more than ever that circumstances compelled my act in smuggling out those complaints, for I knew it would be a blow to those in high command. Details are too numerous and unnecessary. The day upon which I was taken to Fort Leavenworth, Major Townsend told me that he felt that I had not treated them squarely in sending out those letters. I explained to him that if he would examine the post-mark he would see that they were mailed before I had been called to headquarters, that I did not know I would be in his office when I sent out the letters, and that life in the guard house was so intolerable that immediate action had to be taken. A few months after I left, Col. Schultz remarked to one of the prisoners who was later sent to Fort Leavenworth: "Salmon did wrong in sending out those letters, for he could just as well have told us about these matters when he was over in the office." True, I could have done so, but did not because the letters were then two days on their way and for the additional reason previously stated. I will never be able to convince Col. Schultz and Major Townsend that my action was justified, that my intentions were good, because circumstantial evidence is against me. The loss of two good friends was not as hard to bear as the realization that they believed that I had dealt unfairly with them. Had they been the "reprisal" type of men, they could have made things interesting for me. It's little things like this that in international affairs lead to war. Because of misunderstandings or misconceptions or even actual injustice, do you think it right to sacrifice the lives of millions of innocent victims?

When telling the story of how my brother Joe was not allowed to see me at Fort Leavenworth until after two weeks of strenuous effort, and how the circumstances indirectly caused his death ten days later, I mentioned that if unrestrained by religious impulses I would have sought opportunity to murder Col. Rice, I did not mention the manner in which I subdued the bitter feelings that surged within my breast as I laid in that dark hole of solitary confinement and thought of the wickedness of not allowing Joe to visit me. After a time I found myself at the point of laying plans to "get" Rice, or of ordering a retreat for the acrid emotions that raged within me. To permit my mind to dwell upon revenge meant disaster. To check the impulse meant pain. Reflecting that I was a Christian -- or at least professed to be such -- I was forced to the conclusion that there was

one thought only that I should entertain for Col. Rice, and that was -- forgiveness. That point settled I then turned my mental apparatus to the task of adjusting myself to the disappointment of not seeing Joe. There was no one to talk to. I was in the dark hole known as cell 135, which is one of twenty solitary confinement cells in Fort Leavenworth's dungeons. Nor could I find distraction in reading, for there was nothing to read in the cell and it was dark as night. After thinking matters over for some time, I decided upon a policy that I afterwards called the Big 5. This "Big 5" consisted of five words which of themselves suggested lines of thought, that harmonized with Christ's teachings, and the five words were: meek, humble, simple, resigned, and grateful. Thoughts of meekness dispelled the storms of anger that threatened to destroy me; thoughts of humility reminded me of the tortures that I really deserved; thoughts of simplicity suggested how easily these matters could be handled if one would work with Jesus in place of against Him; the word resigned reminded me that one should always be resigned to the will of God; and the final word, grateful, caused an endless stream of thoughts to pour through my mind as I pondered over the many things in life for which I should be thanking God instead of wasting my time complaining over one disappointment.

I suffered another disappointment, while still in the "hole" a little more than one month later. The "Big 5" dissolved the disappointment almost immediately; and it was really a great misfortune, hard to bear, but Christ's remedy banished the pain. I had had an application for a writ of habeas corpus pending in Judge Pollock's court for more than two months - 74 days to be exact. Pollock denied the writ, although virtually admitting that I was entitled to it. He reasoned that I had tried to get a Fourth Class Classification to which I was not otherwise entitled, and upon this assumption he refused the writ of habeas corpus. The facts are not as Judge Pollock stated, but just the contrary, viz: By merely answering the Questionnaire, I would have been placed in Fourth Class because of a dependent wife and widowed-mother, but I refused to avail myself of this loop-hole to escape the consequences of my opposition to wholesale killing. The story is too long; but the bare facts are that Pollock's unwarranted decision caused me to remain in prison. That happened almost two years ago, and I'm still illegally held. Major Smith, executive officer at Fort Leavenworth at the time my writ was denied, said that he too had fully expected that the writ would be granted. Smith is a man of wide experience as a military prosecutor, he knows military law, and his opinion expressed to others beforehand, coupled with my own belief that the writ would be granted, prepared me for a decision exactly opposite that that Judge Pollock rendered. But, if I handle every disappointment in life as easily as I handled that one, I'll have smooth sailing. The incident, however, is another illustration of how injustice can easily be borne if one depends upon Christ instead of upon himself. Now, had I been a militarist, and if I had an army at my disposal, Judge Pollock would have had to call his army to the colors in order to wage a defensive war. That is the way it happens in international affairs. Pollock wronged me, but he would be fighting in self-defense if I set out with an army to right the wrong. Armies do not right wrongs, but militarists think

that they do.

My Agnostic friends will consider as an indication of weakness, the plan that I adopted for resolving my mental conflicts. I believe that the criticism is justified. But the weakness is that sort that recognizes God's superiority, and human nature is such that it requires strength to admit that one is weak. If nations were strong enough to admit their impotency, there was no need of armaments. If nations would resort to meekness, humility, simplicity, resignation, and gratitude as substitutes for physical strength, and ask for God's grace to apply these virtues to the settlement of international imbroglios, they would experience the truth of Christ's words: "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted." Otherwise, they will be reminded that Christ also said: "He that exalteth himself shall be humbled." Germany is, no doubt, pondering the latter words today, as in time all nations must if they depend upon breeders of pride as a means of defense.

One day I was having an argument with Knud Lassen, a fellow C.O. at Fort Douglas. I got so mad that I walked away from him and would not let him explain certain statements that had angered me. And I told other prisoners -- within hearing distance of Lassen -- how unfair he was. I afterwards learned that the unfairness was all on my side. Had I kept cool and listened to what Lassen had to say, I would have learned something worth while, and it would have become apparent to me that there was no cause for offense in the words that angered me. I could cite many instances like this in my life. I have been a bad Indian on this anger business. Christ said "Judge not," but I have judged a great deal. Of course I am trying to overcome it, and I am sure that I will eventually succeed. Nations judge each other the same way, quick temperedly, without justification, and the misjudgment travels swiftly from one point to another until war is finally declared and millions of men are called to the defense -- of a mistake. It would not be so bad if the men ordered to butcher one another had made the mistake; but the ones that err sit in palatial homes, smoke fine cigars, are wined and dined, and they continue to make more mistakes in order to cover up the first mistake. My admissions of rash judgment might justify a 99% discount of all that I say about nations and individuals, but I have not admitted nor do I admit rash judgment in the matter of printed statements or the written word. One has a little more time to consider things when writing, especially if he writes of an incident a long time after it happens. The World War, in which I refused to participate, ended a long time ago. One can write dispassionately about a subject even though he at times allows his passions to carry him away in conversation. Diplomats snap away at each other for a few times and then call out the army. If they would devote a few months time to the issue, write about it, think it over thoroughly, discuss it freely, they would finally decide that the "just war" they intended to engage in was just the thing to be avoided.

This anger business calls to mind the time when Christ drove the moneychangers out of the temple, an argument that militarists often use in defense of their policy. The story is told in John

2:14, - 16 which read: "And He found in the temple them that sold oxen and sheep and doves, and the changers of money sitting. And when He had made, as it were, a scourge of little cords, He drove them all out of the temple, the sheep also and the oxen, and the money of the changers He poured out, and the tables He overthrew. And to them that sold doves He said: Take these things hence, and make not the house of my Father a house of traffic." Evidently, in this instance, Christ did use physical force. There are many points to consider, though. He did not strike anybody with the cords, and it was no doubt necessary to brandish them in order to persuade the oxen and the sheep, for animals do not always respond to the mere sound of the human voice. Too, it was the only incident in Christ's career where He departed from His policy of meekness and persuasion, and, having occurred in His Father's house which was dedicated to prayer and worship, He may have wished to express His wrath for the purpose of impressing upon those traders and all the people for all time that God's temple is not to be trifled in. If the meek and patient One became so enraged over trafficking in His Father's temple of prayer, that is no excuse for persons tearing one another to pieces outside God's temple. Moreover, Christ had a right to do as He did which we do not possess, and there was not any inconsistency in His actions, taking place as they did in the Temple. He was not teaching us how to live when He drove the moneychangers and the animals out, because such duties do not devolve upon us. Had any of His disciples undertaken to drive out the animals and the men by brandishing a scourge of little cords, Christ surely would have rebuked them just as He rebuked Peter for using the sword, although the occasion of using the sword is not an exact parallel for the reason that that incident was one of defense where the temple was one of aggression. Since Christ would not sanction the use of the sword in self-defense, He certainly would not sanction its use in aggression. While He acted aggressively in the temple, He did not strike a single individual. You might claim that if the moneychangers did not flee that He would have struck them. That is questionable; we do know that they fled from His authority just as armies will today flee when the name of God is invoked without the use of Satan's weapons. Christ had a divine right to expel evil from His temple in whatever manner He chose, but His actions in that event do not justify us in deviating from the rules that He laid down for our guidance.

I will now present a brief summary of the argument that I have made in such unmethodical sequence. I have a number of alibis for having written this matter in such a disconnected fashion. In the first place, I am considered insane, and if I wrote too orderly it might appear that I was trying to disprove my insanity. I previously explained how, in waiting for certain books and documents, I had to zigzag with my argument in order to avoid losing time that could not afterwards be made up; having a limited time in which to present the matter, it had to be done as good as possible under the circumstances. The distractions have been aggravating; they almost ruined my angelic disposition. One cannot expect raving maniacs to keep quiet while another maniac

attempts to vindicate his stand as a hunger-striking conscientious objector, so the noise kept up around here. The pandemonium would occasionally die out, but not for very long. The evenings have been fairly quiet except for the noise and chatter of the guards, which has often been more confusing than the rantings of my fellow lunatics. On the whole, my insanity is about all that saved me, for if I were sane the continuous tumult day after day certainly would have driven me crazy. Too, I have been exceptionally weak, and when one is enfeebled physically his mental activities are not as orderly as under normal circumstances. Many are the times that I have lain on my cot waiting until I could muster sufficient strength to proceed with this writing. An exclusively liquid diet seems to not make one very strong; nothing else can be fed one forcibly. Of course I can get solid food, but that will be breaking my hunger strike, which I propose to not do. After concluding my summary I will explain the logic of my hunger strike.

The political and humanitarian reasons for my stand as a C.O. hardly require much reference in this summary, because, first of all, my stand is primarily on religious grounds, and secondly, there is little to be said in summarizing the first two phases mentioned. I pointed out in some detail why a workingman has nothing to gain fighting capitalists' war. Just now I merely wish to clinch the declaration by contrast: a capitalist has nothing to gain in fighting in a workingman's war. For instance, would it be financial wisdom for a financier to enlist as a private in the Bolshevik army? Regarding humanitarians, it has been shown that since members of a family and citizens of a community and in the cities and in the states and in the entire nation manage their affairs without mobilizing armies, it should not be unreasonable to expect an application of such a plan to international affairs with a view to ultimately abandoning physical coercion. The humanitarian can get along with his fellow men without forcing his opinions upon them, without compelling them with brute strength to do whatever he wishes to have done, so his part in the game of life is to teach others the ideal while living according to it himself, instead of stooping to their level of deception, hatred, and butchery.

The religious C.O. has reason to believe that the mere thought of God is stronger than an army. If God can save one person, he can save a billion persons; numbers do not bother the Almighty. I have quoted a great number of passages from scripture to prove that Christ's doctrine is anti-war. It may have seemed that so many citations were superfluous, but I wanted to produce sufficient evidence to offset any attempt at contradiction. The one incident of Christ driving the money changers out of the temple is urged so vigorously on behalf of militarism that I believed it necessary to instance the many admonitions of Jesus that prove conclusively that our Divine Lord wants us to lead a life of meekness, forgiveness, kindness, and love. In a certain sense though, one citation is as good as fifty. "Overcome evil with good" covers the whole situation, and if one were to argue for centuries, he could not present Christ's philosophy any clearer or any more forcefully than is done in those four words.

Cardinal Gibbons tells us: "The Bible is the only book that our Saviour is known ever to have read or quoted in the whole course of His sacred ministry." Another example of what our reading should mostly consist of. In His omniscience, Christ knew what to select as the most profitable reading, and He chose the Bible. If Christians would read the Bible and govern their lives according to it, war would be impossible. Christ's teachings save us from delusions. Germany was suffering from a delusion when she thought that France on one side, naval England on the other, and Russia on the other were going to attack her. Delusions are real to the deluded as I have closely observed in this insane asylum. So-called "preparedness" is the outgrowth of a delusion, we fear that some nation is going to attack us, and eventually, in order to save ourselves, we attack first just as Germany did. But the plan does not always work; it did not save Germany. The beauty of Christ's teachings -- I should have said the attractiveness of His teachings -- lies in the fact that the sane and the insane can follow him with equal security.

In the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew we learn that perseverance is our salvation. As we are warned in that and other chapters though, it must be perseverance of the righteous sort, not the kind that perseveres in the construction of deadly armaments. In the same chapter we are warned that death comes like a thief in the night. This is true also of nations. It came to Germany like a thief in the night, and it will so come to all nations putting their trust in the mailed fist. Nations that trust in battleships and in armies are, like our bodies, mortal; nations that trust in the Word of God for defense are, like our souls, immortal, nothing can harm them, they will live on to the end of time even though they may perhaps suffer an occasional attack. Like the attacks upon our souls by the evil one, attacks against those nations relying upon the power of God and living in unity with His Spirit will avail nothing.

A Catholic priest writing for The Nation of March 6th said in part: "The clergy might have kept their record clear if they had made this teaching plain once and for all, even though they did it hurriedly and quietly. But it was left in the silence of the grave. They knew how troubled were many hearts, how tortured by doubts were many souls. Yet never a word was said for conscience and justice. Prudence, to be sure, urged caution on the leaders of the church. It is a very earthly prudence, but one that must be reckoned with; for the champions of the various creeds are always quick to take strategic advantage of any unpopular utterances on the part of their opponents. But can earthly prudence or human fear ever justify silence on a vital doctrine or belief? Deliberate silence on such a vital and fundamental point of morals as this of the personal and inalienable responsibility of every participant in war comes perilously close to rending the whole spiritual fabric." That priest was writing upon the question of conscientious objectors in the World War. What he said applies to peacetime preparations as well as wartime activities. Will the question of disarmament be "left in the silence of the grave" until our sinful acts convulse the world in another holy and just war?

One of Cardinal Gibbons' Maxims reads: "Remember that the moral Ruler of the world holds the reins of government, which He never surrenders -- so long as He guides and controls the chariot that carries you and your fortunes, happen what will, you have nothing to fear, provided you put your trust in Him. 'Hope in the Lord and do good, and He will give you the desires of your heart.'" If what the Cardinal said is true, then it must apply to two persons as well as to one person. If it applies to more than one person, it applies to everybody in the world. He made four points upon which I will dwell. Point No-1: God holds the reins of government -- all the governments in the world. Point No-2: If we trust Him, we have nothing to fear, consequently it were folly to maintain armies and navies for fear that one of the governments God is directing will pounce upon and dismember us. Point No-3: In addition to trusting in God, we must do good; and we have learned from injuries suffered at the hands of others that armies and navies are not implements of good; therefore, since we must do good, we must forsake these agencies of evil. Point No-4: If one hopes in God and does good one will realize the desires of his heart. Which of course applies to nations also. Individuals and nations desire Peace. Then, according to the Cardinal, all that is necessary is to hope in God and do good, I believe that the Maxim of Cardinal Gibbons that I have just quoted and afterwards divided into four sections, proves the truth of all that I have written in previous pages on the question of conserving the common good without the use of bullets.

One may lose wealth, position, and influence through advocacy of disarmament, but God will compensate both in this world and in the next. As individuals and as a nation, we have everything to gain, nothing to lose, by preaching with example rather than by word the doctrine of forgiveness, kindness, and love. We must be tolerant of those like Judge Cohalan, and patiently point out to them that the British Navy is not as great a menace to America as America's Navy is. In one of his concluding paragraphs in the pamphlet entitled "The Freedom of the Seas" Judge Cohalan declares: "If America lives up to its high traditions and considers above all things the interests of America, it will preserve our country, save human liberty and destroy, with injury to none who seek liberty, the grim curse of Navalism which hangs like a heavy cloud over the fortunes of mankind." The way to destroy navalism is to begin at home -- scrap the American fleet. This example of Christianity will enable us to divert the hundreds of millions now spent on our navy for rescuing such as those whom I will mention in the next paragraph.

The Denver Catholic Register of August 19th relates some of the stories of Father John Collins, Ly.Af.M., missionary in Liberia, West Africa. Death by famine is common there. One story will suffice: "We were passing through a field when we came across a little girl of five, actually dying of starvation. We learned that her parents had both died, and that her aunt, having nothing to give the child, carried her out to the field and left her there to die. The poor little soul was in a most horrible condition.

(continued on next page)

"Her limbs were swollen, and her whole body was covered with vermin, a most revolting sight! We first baptized the child, and then carried her to the mission where she could hardly eat the rice for which she had craved, perhaps, for weeks." The Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions, 2021 H. Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., solicits donations for such cases as Father Collins described, which, according to Father Collins, "is only a sample of the gruesome sights easily multiplied hundreds of times over." Little donations will help, but think of the big donation that could be made if America would divert the treasure of her war chest into channels of mercy! Father Peter Guilday, Ph.D., Professor of Church History at the Catholic University of America, writing from Vienna quite recently said: "After seeing the battlefields of France, one would imagine he had seen Europe at its worst. By no means! Here, and here of all places in the world, can the real horrors of the war be seen. Ninety-seven per cent of the young girls of 14 cannot live because of the malnutrition of the past five years ... Vienna, outwardly, is not indeed much different from when I last saw it in 1908. But away from the center of the city the sights are beyond belief ... The superioress of a little band of Sisters of Charity wept this morning as she told me their work was threatened for lack of funds. That work I saw till my heart was sick. Row after row of little beds on which were dying children, slowly wasting away because of the horrors of the past five years. If only an appeal could be made to American Catholics to awaken to the need of these children of the faith." From all parts of the world comes the news of starvation and disease. And then people wonder why certain ones among us are conscientiously opposed to war! We oppose war because it is unnecessary; because it is the greatest breeder of suffering and distress that the world has ever known; because the money spent upon preparation for war should be used to mitigate the deplorable ills of humanity.

We know rats destroy millions -- yes, hundreds of millions -- of dollars worth of property every year, in addition to breeding disease. We have known this for a long, long time. The political office holders are busy holding office, so unless there is a great popular demand they will not make a drive toward rat extermination. Their relation to the people is the same regarding war. A great popular demand will be necessary in order to bring about disarmament. Many will oppose disarmament, particularly among the Christians. The C.O. has played his part during the war, and he will continue in times of peace. With so much divergence of opinion, with so many pulling against each other, the problem resolves itself into the necessity of starting with ourselves. Do what is right ourselves, then teach others. That we may know whether we are doing what is right ourselves, we must daily study the Bible and learn what the Master wants us to do, for Christ tells us in John 14:6: "I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No man cometh to the Father, but by Me."

I will now explain the logic of my hunger strike, after which I will make some observations concerning the conscientious objector and this little job will be finished. First of all,

I am in prison not because I violated a law, but because I refused to violate a law. Not only was I loyal to God's law but also to man's law. The U. S. Constitution specifically stipulates that Congress shall make no law abridging the right of freedom of press, speech, or assemblage; it guarantees freedom of conscience. Our lawbreakers in Washington decided to make a scrap of paper out of the U. S. Constitution, some of us objected to the procedure, and we are still in jail. That we were standing for the rights of Conscience and not following a line of expediency has been proven by our enduring more than two years -- in some cases more than three years -- of torture and imprisonment, and we are still on the job. Every day during our confinement, the gate to freedom swung wide on the road of compromise, it was easy to get out if we would recant. If I were imprisoned for having done wrong, I would expiate for my offense. Or, if my imprisonment did not involve the responsibility of morally supporting the killing machine, I would willingly suffer the unjust imprisonment.

That I wanted to avoid suicide is evidenced by an incident that happened in the early days of my hunger strike. I thought that I should do my best to avoid death, so I decided to escape from prison in the event that they did not release me. Francis X. Hennessy, a fellow prisoner, advised me against this plan, but at first I did not heed his advice. After a little reflection though, I saw that escaping would be running away from the fight, so I determined that I would die if not released in the proper manner. Hennessy did not urge me to abandon the escape idea because he wanted to see me die, but because he thought that I would be released. I did not think that I would be released. In fact it appeared for many days that the news would not even get outside the prison until after I was dead. Fred Briehl, another fellow prisoner, volunteered to escape and take the news to Salt Lake City and then break into prison again. A big change for Briehl to take, for he was due to be released within about a week, and, if caught doing that which he volunteered to do, he would be kept in prison for perhaps years longer. I thanked him for his heroic offer, but suggested that we wait a few days longer. Every effort was being made to get the news out. Will Doty and some other prisoners -- just who the others were I did not learn for certain -- got the news out a few days before, but it was not until the tenth day of my hunger strike that we learned that the news was really out. Now, the only reason that the idea of escaping was entertained by me originally, was to, if possible, avoid death so that I would not have the guilt of suicide upon my conscience. As related before, I finally decided that the only proper course was to die if not released in the proper manner.

When my dear mother visited me in the prison ward of the Fort Douglas hospital on the twelfth day of my hunger strike, she said: "You ask God for daily bread and then refuse to eat it." The opinion expressed by my mother is the view of a great many. I do not refuse to eat; I refuse to eat if by eating I am compelled to morally support the killing machine. If I die it will not be suicide on my part, but murder on the part of those who are keeping me in prison.

Before leaving the prison on the day mentioned in the previous paragraph, my mother agreed that my hunger strike was right and that I should continue it. I will explain it as I did to my mother: Granting that militarism is wrong, it then follows that a Christian should not support it. By eating the food of those who have me imprisoned -- that is by eating the food of the military authorities -- I thereby help to maintain my life in prison. By refusing to eat until I am released, they are driven to the point of murdering or releasing me. There is a middle course of forcible feeding, which they adopted after I had been without food for thirteen days, but forcible feeding is merely another form of killing me, it does the job on the installment plan. Life can be sustained by forcible feeding, but not properly sustained because there is no mastication of the liquid food and it is impossible to forcibly feed one any solid food. These two elements, viz: mastication and solid food are essential to proper sustenance. One can even regain lost weight on liquid food, but that does not prove that liquid food provides adequate nutriment. I lost 25 pounds during the first 20 days of my hunger strike, but during the time from the 20th day until now -- this is my 61st, day -- I have gained a little in weight, how much I do not know. I do know, however, that I have gained, or rather recovered, a little of my lost weight because my face appears fuller and my body more solid than when I was at low tide on the 13th day of the hunger strike.

Returning to the point of taking a stand for liberty or death: If released from prison, I cease to morally support the killing machine; if death ensues, I cease to morally support the killing machine. I gain my end in either event. Now, suppose that I continued to eat. A good friend of mine said: "If you continue to eat and to serve your sentence, you will be a living example of opposition to things military." Granted. I would also be a living example of what will happen to those who resist American militarism, and in this fact is contained the moral support that I would render by voluntarily eating the food of the militarists. If released from prison, the machine would not then have me to point to as an example of what happens to those who resist it. If I die, it is unlikely that they would point to my death as an instance of what happens to those who resist militarism, because my dying means that they have murdered me and even militarists are not proud of being murderers. Too, it would seem inconsistent to declare that the military organization was maintained for the sake of preserving Democracy if, at the same time, the military organization did to death one who is religiously opposed to things military. One of the fundamentals of Democracy is freedom of religious belief. If one cannot serve God according to the dictates of his conscience, what good is a Democracy? I will discuss the question of "conscience" in my concluding remarks.

Granting that my confinement serves as a moral support to the military machine -- and if it didn't, they would not have put me here to begin with -- and granting that voluntarily

eating tends to increase the length of my confinement which in turn increases or lengthens the time that I would render moral support to the military machine, the question then to settle is: "Is a hunger strike suicide?" I just made an assertion that perhaps should be proved before considering the question of suicide. I said that if my confinement did not serve to morally support the military machine, the military authorities would not confine me. It may be argued that I was confined as a matter of punishment for wrong-doing, and not to obtain moral support for the killing machine. First of all, I did no wrong, as previously explained. In the second place, viewing my act of refusing to render military service, in the light of militarism, as wrong-doing and therefore meriting punishment, it must be evident that my confinement does reflect moral support to the killing machine because my punishment is pointed to as the result of anti-militarism. So, regardless of the fact that I did no wrong, my action is nevertheless considered as wrong-doing and punished accordingly. Therefore, granting that I was confined as a matter of punishment for wrong-doing and not to obtain moral support for the killing machine, the net result is the same regardless, viz: the punishment that I am undergoing serves as an example to others.

Now for the question of suicide. I maintain that it is not suicide on my part but murder on the part of the authorities. If to let me die is not murder, why do they forcibly feed me? It cannot be said that mercy is their motive, for the merciful act would be to release me. Moreover, forcible feeding, while not acutely painful is quite distressful nevertheless. Every time that I am subjected to the feeding I long for the day when I will be relieved either by death or by freedom, although as explained in the early part of what I wrote, I offer the minimum amount of resistance for the reasons stated at that time. I was told at this hospital -- St. Elizabeth's -- that if not forcibly fed, if allowed to die, the hospital authorities would be accused of murder. I have quoted the exact words of one doctor and the substance of the statement made by another doctor. Their testimony corroborates what I have said about suicide vs. murder. I will begin to eat whenever relieved of the responsibility of morally supporting militarism. In other words, I will begin to eat whenever released from prison; not before. Whatever sacrifice is involved I am offering in the service of God for the good of man. If ever released from prison, I expect to oppose militarism just as I did during the years before I was jailed. If I fail to keep the faith myself, I could not honestly urge others to hold aloof from the evils of militarism. When I satisfied myself that hunger striking was not suicide, it became my duty to hunger strike, for that is the logical attitude of the C.O. Had I been able to convince myself earlier in the game, I would have gone on a hunger strike that much sooner.

Did Jesus Christ commit suicide? He could have saved Himself from the mob. He could have come down from the cross. I am not Divine, but I could save myself by eating. But to eat would be to sacrifice the principle involved in order to

save my life. Suppose that, in order to save His life, Christ sacrificed the principle of anti-paganism? Suppose an American soldier were captured by the enemy and threatened with death unless he divulged certain secrets; do you think that he ought to sacrifice his principles in order to save his life? You will say that imparting knowledge of those secrets to the enemy will cost the lives of many American soldiers and that the one soldier captured should forfeit his life as the lesser of two evils. If I recant on my hunger strike such recanting will indirectly cost the lives of many innocent civilians in time to come because it will strengthen the hold of militarism upon the youth of America. It may appear that I am attaching considerable importance to my hunger strike. Not at all. It is the military crowd that attaches importance to it, otherwise they would not resort to forcible feeding in order to keep me alive and in prison. They recognize a worthwhile issue else they would either release me or let me die. Even in the matter of forcible feeding the authorities have tacitly admitted that it is only a lease upon life granted in the hope that I will eventually recede from my extreme stand. Understand, they have not used these words, but the implication is clear. Moreover, I am given a more-balanced liquid ration now then when first forcibly fed. Why? Because the original method would kill me too quickly, and they want to stretch it out. At first, only milk was administered. Then for several days milk and eggs. I complained to the doctors and told them that the one-sided diet was killing me and that it was their duty to either allow me to die or reduce the injury to a minimum by supplying a more balanced ration. It seemed queer to them that a person refusing food should ask for certain kinds of food. I explained that I was not asking for certain kinds of food, that I refused all manner of food, but, since they were forcibly feeding me, feeding me against my will, it became their duty to reduce the injury to a minimum instead of raising it to a maximum. They alleviated the torture by administering a variety of liquids in place of the former diet. Why is it that the doctors did not ignore my complaint and continue the one-sided diet? Because, as they well knew, the one-sided diet was killing me. Now, if I were trying to commit suicide, I would let the one-sided diet continue, for the manner in which milk and eggs three times a day was playing havoc with my digestive organs made it clear to me that I could not live long in that manner. Asking the doctors to let me die or reduce the injury of their forcible feeding to a minimum was not asking for death but merely pointing out their duty to them. My stand remained the same: liberty or death, a continued refusal of any and all food unless released from prison.

Now for the question of conscience, a few observations on the Conscientious Objector. I had intended devoting some time to this subject, promised myself that I would cover the issue fairly well. Exercising one of my constitutional rights, I have changed my mind and will deal only with what I believe are the essential features and upon those I will touch only superficially, because the time is short and the ravings of this maniac must be

brought to a close. If I ever get sane again, I might undertake to write up the C.O. question as I feel it deserves to be written up. I am incapable of doing justice to it even when sane, but I will at least do the best that I can if it should be within the province of God's will to so ordain at some time in the future.

I believe that I have, in previous pages, stated the objective reasons for the C.O. stand at sufficient length to avoid the necessity of further mention. Let us now consider the subjective reasons. One question that might be asked is: "Why are you willing to cause your wife and child and other relatives so much suffering for the sake of an abstract theoretical principle?" I previously answered this question at some length in the early part of my statement, wherein I explained that there is no certainty that I have caused my wife and child and other relations any suffering whatever, for, had I pursued the course opposite to the stand taken, my relatives may have suffered more than they have in the present instance. Fact is, I am quite certain that they would have suffered more, for one cannot injure his fellow men and not pay the penalty therefore. The Law of Compensation may be years in settling accounts, but it never fails to balance affairs in the end. Having previously cited how participation in war injures my fellow men, and having shown that the pretext of self-defense is a feeble attempt at self-justification, I need not now again prove that I would have injured my fellow men without warrant had I taken part in the war. What is true of me is true of other C.O.s.

A friend once told me: "You must realize that your sacrifice may do no good, or, at the most, it will do very little good. If you could look into the future 200 years and see how little good you have done, you would wonder if the game were worth the candle." I doubt the truth of this assertion, still, for purposes of argument I will admit that it is a cold statement of fact. What then? Well, I will have been true to conviction, true to myself, loyal to God, and devoted to the best interests of mankind. Moreover, if I accomplish only a little good, that is better than doing a great deal of harm.

It is also said that, however sincere the C.O. may be, he might be wrong, and the case of the soldier is cited. The soldier sacrifices so much, and sacrifices so honestly; yet, look at the result! True, one may be wrong, Christ is the model of the religious C.O., and if His life and His teachings are studied it will be easy to determine whether a person is on the right track. Regarding the humanitarian and political C.O.s. I will in a little while explain how they are to determine what, beyond doubt, is right. It is my intention to group all three classes in a general explanation or justification of their attitude. For the present, however, I will state that the humanitarian objector may judge what is absolutely right by the simple standard of humanitarianism. For instance: A person of average intelligence would not treat a dog in the manner that a soldier treats a human being in the enemy army. Nor can the humanitarian be fooled with

the "self-defense" fake, for he has observed that every city in every state defends its citizens against surrounding cities without the aid of an army. The political objector knows that it is wrong to slay fellow workingmen in the interests of millionaires for the same reasons that cause the millionaire to decide that it is wrong to slay fellow millionaires in the interests of working men.

In that part of my argument that originally led up to a defense of the C.O. stand, I refuted the claims of those Catholics who declared that our attitude as conscientious objectors is wrong. Since then, I have been able to procure material from what might be termed an anti-Catholic source. I use this term "anti-Catholic" perhaps wrongly, for The Truth Seeker³⁶ is likely not anti-Catholic. Anyway, I will quote from a source of thought that is quite far removed from Catholicism. The Truth Seeker is advertised as "The Leading Freethought Journal of the World." Some time ago it had an editorial on "The Conscientious Objector." Part of the editorial reads: "In the first place, the kernel of the whole controversy lies in this: continued residence in any country must be held to imply a tacit agreement to obey its laws. Those who break this contract are treated as lawbreakers and criminals." The latter part of the quotation is correct. C.O.s. are treated as lawbreakers and criminals, but that does not make them such, Jesus Christ was treated as a lawbreaker and a criminal but that was no proof that He was a lawbreaker and a criminal. Let us now consider the first part of the quotation, which reads: "continued residence in any country must be held to imply a tacit agreement to obey its laws." Suppose the editor of The Truth Seeker were a resident of Spain during the 16th or the 17th century. Suppose that he were ordered to war upon the Huguenots. Would he obey that edict of the Catholics? Since continued residence in Spain must be held to imply a tacit agreement to obey its laws, and since the Catholics have decided to war upon the Protestants, friend Truth Seeker must polish his rifle or contradict the editorial that I have just quoted. He cannot excuse himself by saying that he did not live at that time, for C.O.ism applies to all times. There are certain people who fear that the Catholics are trying to capture the reins of government in America. Suppose that such a thing did happen. Suppose that the Catholics in power passed a conscription law and ordered us to go to war against Protestant England in order to carry the truth of Catholicism into that departed section of the Church. It is my humble opinion that the Truth Seeker would be a C.O. in a case of this kind. No danger of such a war, but, if the Catholics were in power and declared what the Truth Seeker believed an unjustifiable war upon another country, I think that he would be just as much of a C.O. as he would have been in the 16th Century if conscripted to slaughter the Huguenots.

Again quoting from The Truth Seeker: "It is surely obvious that a man who cannot from conscientious reasons defend his country cannot for the very same reasons participate in the benefits earned by methods which his conscience so severely condemns." First of all the C.O. does defend his country, but he

defends it in the proper rather than in the wrong manner. In time of war, the humanitarian objector defends his country against the bestial inclinations to which his fellow citizens have for the time become slaves; the political objector defends his country against the snares of profiteers by which his fellow citizens have for the time become deceived; the religious objector defends his country by loyalty to God whom his fellow citizens have for the time betrayed into the camp of Satan. As I told Col. Goodale when he delivered his fruitless Fourth of July oration in an attempt to recruit workers from the ranks of the C.O.s: "One can do more good for his country in a single day by remaining loyal to God than a million Goodales can do in a dozen years by taking part in a wholesale violation of the command to not kill." Now, concerning "the benefits earned by methods which the C.O. so severely condemns." What are those benefits? One of them is a burdensome war debt that must be paid in order to fatten the swollen pockets of the international bankers. The C.O. participates in this benefit. Another benefit is deprivation of our constitutional rights. Perhaps I am not entitled to that benefit because I am insane, but I know a group of genuine heroes in the Fort Douglas War Prison who are tonight enjoying a phase of this particular benefit, and they have been enjoying it for some years now; a few weeks on bread and water now and then with an occasional beating or hosing is thrown in to break the monotony of prison travail. I have heard a great number of soldier boys who took part in the war ask different people "What benefit did we get out of the war?" The people asked were not able to tell them, I was not able to tell them. This is perhaps a secret of The Truth Seeker. I wonder if the C.O.s. in the 16th and 17th centuries participated in the benefits earned by the Catholic Wars upon the Huguenots?

The Truth Seeker then goes on to state that "during "the whole period of the war the alternative of emigration was always open to him and the fact of his continued voluntary residence in America must be held to imply acquiescence in the policy from which he continued to derive personal advantage." The Truth Seeker ought to seek the truth before he makes any such statements. I for one was denied emigration. Messrs Brandborg and Iverson will vouch for the statement that, while a prisoner in the Camp Dodge guard house, I sought opportunity to go to Germany and preach C.O.ism, agreeing to come back after the war and serve whatever sentence had been imposed upon me by the court-martial. At the time that I wrote my letter I did not know what my sentence was, but I offered to provide safeguards for the government so that there would be little likelihood of my failure to return and serve the sentence provided that I was not killed in the course of my agitation on the other side. Uncle Sammy would not let me go, would not even discuss the matter with me, did not even acknowledge receipt of my letter. I know that he got the letter, for I handed it to one of the officers, and mail that was not returned to a prisoner was supposed to have been forwarded. It is possible that the letter did not get beyond the Commanding Officer at Camp Dodge, but anyway I tried to emigrate and preach Christianity in Germany since they would not allow me to preach it in America. I succeeded in failing.

Following the statement quoted in the previous paragraph, Truth Seeker says: "As therefore his conscientious objection was not strong enough to induce him to make any sacrifice, it cannot at a later date constitute a claim to discriminatory treatment. Nothing is therefore left to him but an appeal to the charity of the state and of his fellow-citizens." We seek justice, not charity. We seek the justice that is suggested in an advertisement of The Truth Seeker. This advertisement is published on the back cover of an Agnostic book entitled "Age of Reason" by Thomas Paine. The advertisement solicits subscriptions for The Truth Seeker, and it reads in part: "The Truth Seeker works for liberty, for the opportunity for every Christian to worship as he chooses, and for the right of the infidel to refrain from worship without being robbed of his citizenship. It stands for one man's right to be a heretic and for another's to be any kind of a religious believer he pleases. It stands for absolute liberty, for a perfectly unfettered freedom of the human mind, which is now so cramped and chained by custom and creed." Splendid! There is, however, considerable contrast between what The Truth Seeker promises in its ad and what is actually contained in the editorial quoted from. Since the Truth Seeker stands for "a perfectly unfettered freedom of the human mind," why tell the conscientious objector that there is nothing "left to him but an appeal to the charity of the state and of his fellow citizens?" Was it proper to feel in that manner toward a Protestant in the 16th century who refused on conscientious grounds to participate in a Catholic war against the Huguenots? Truth is the same in the 20th as it was in the 16th century.

The next paragraph in The Truth Seeker's editorial reads: "If the objectors had asked as a favor for exemption from combatant service and had shown their gratitude for this favor by their willingness to undertake other forms of service to the state, public opinion would have condoned their inconsistency." Public opinion has no authority to condone inconsistency. There is no compromise between right and wrong. If public opinion does the wrong thing by condoning inconsistency, that is no excuse for condemning the C.O. because of his compatibility. Some C.O.s did take non-combatant service. I will later make reference to this fact, but not for the purpose of criticizing those who did take such service. It is my intention to confine my remarks to the stand taken by what we term the absolutist C.O. This latter class not only did not ask for non-combatant service "as a favor," but also repeatedly declined gratuitous and alluring offers of such favors. That we were actuated by a principle rather than by stubbornness is evidenced by an incident that occurred in the Fort Douglas prison last winter. Influenza was raging in Salt Lake City, four miles distant. Dr. Beatty of the Utah State Board of Health sent out a call for volunteer nurses, stating in the call that training was unnecessary, that the need was so urgent that any person capable of doing ordinary work around the house could render invaluable assistance. The Doctor told of cases where entire families were stricken and that it was impossible to get people to perform simple household tasks for them. The Red Cross also sent out a pitiful appeal. Forty-three of the

conscientious objectors in the Fort Douglas prison immediately prepared a letter, signed it, forwarded it to Secretary of War Newton D. Baker, and telegraphed the content in order to expedite matters. Were it not that my personal belongings have not reached here from Fort Douglas, I could quote the letter. I will state the substance: We volunteered to act in the capacities indicated in the appeal; our services were to be rendered without compensation; we sought no consideration as the result of whatever aid might be rendered to the community -- that is we did not want any reduction in our sentences or any favor whatsoever; we agreed to return to prison as quickly as released from service in the emergency and continue serving our sentences. The capabilities of the volunteers were well known to the authorities, many were professional men skilled in the arts and sciences, some possessed a marked degree of therapeutic skill. Two days later the newspapers heralded the fact that Secretary Baker declined to allow us to render the badly needed aid. For several days thereafter, the newspaper's continued appeals from Dr. Beatty or the Red Cross and sometimes from both, but the C.O. nurses and caretakers were not permitted to assist in the crisis. We could not conscientiously work in a military hospital, for, as explained some time ago, the medical department of the army is quite a necessary cog in the military wheel. But we were ready and had offered to do civilian work gratis. Our letter made it clear that we were not criminals, in order to assure Dr. Beatty that desperate convicts were not attempting to enter homes. As we explained, we were merely political offenders with clean records in civilian life, which could be vouched for by those who had us in charge. One of the volunteers would have been particularly valuable during the epidemic. His name is Howard Moore, an efficiency expert, he had considerable experience as ward master in a hospital, quite a clever fellow in the care of the sick. Moore is anything but a criminal. His civilian record is unimpeachable, and he has been an ideal prisoner except for the fact that he would not work; his refusal to work though, was in harmony with his original absolutist stand. While Moore was manacled to the bars in the dungeons at Fort Leavenworth for his refusal to compromise, he was awarded a Carnegie medal and \$500.00 for heroism. Baker could not see his way clear to let this man perform a work of mercy at a time of great public need.

The aforementioned advertisement soliciting subscriptions for The Truth Seeker goes on to state: "The Truth Seeker works for equality. When one man can build a church, and make another support it, there is no equality between them." Well, is there any equality in the case of one man building a military machine and making another man not only support it but also fertilize it with his blood and bones? The ad further says: "When one man does as he likes on one day of the week and forces another to do as he does also, then equality ceases, and we have master and slave." Granted. But, how about the case where one man does as he likes on seven days of the week and forces another to do as he does also? This is seven times worse than the case that Truth Seeker speaks of. I refer to military service of course.

Don't bring in the self-defense buncombe, for I have riddled that fallacy before. Truth Seeker continues: "When the tyrant takes the education of the other man's children into his care and keeping, the equality still further disappears." Just what the militarist does, not only in time of war but also in time of peace. The compulsory military training in many of our schools and colleges is a case in point. Truth Seeker finally says: "It is The Truth Seeker's work to make the boasted equality of man actual, and not the catch phrase it now is." Then why write the kind of an editorial that you did, on the conscientious objector?

The comparison between what The Truth Seeker claims in its advertisement and what we actually find in the editorial columns, is on a par with what my own church -- the Catholic -- teaches in its books and preaches in its sermons as compared with what it actually puts into practice in the matter of affairs military. The only safe guide for one's conduct is to follow the teachings of Christ, which are mirrored quite accurately in that section of the U. S. Constitution that declares for freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of assemblage, and in that part of the Declaration of Independence that declares for freedom of religious belief. If a person is entitled to believe as he wishes in matters religious, he ought also to be entitled to believe as he wishes in matters political. Such rights are guaranteed under the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States but denied by The Truth Seeker and The Catholic Hierarchy in the case of conscientious objectors.

Among those who registered as conscientious objectors -- more than 6,000, I do not remember the exact figure -- only approximately 600 landed in prison. A great many of those who did not land in prison accepted either non-combatant service or farm furloughs. The remainder were released from the various camps after the armistice was declared. All were C.O.s, but different types were to be found among them, and even among those who landed in prison, because they would not accept any kind of service, were to be found those who consented to perform prison labor and those who refused to perform prison labor. What is the principle that actuated these C.O.s, and what is the explanation for the gradation from the point of accepting non-combatant service to that of refusing everything even the performance of prison labor? In other words, why were some C.O.s compromisers and some absolutists?

The first question should be answered first, viz: What underlying principle actuated the C.O.s? There were various types of C.O.s, and, among these various types, there was another division because some took non-combatant service while others were absolutists. There must be some common ground upon which all the C.O.s stood. My observations incline me to believe that that common ground was one of Friendship, Love, and Truth. This triune motive seemed to outweigh all other considerations and impel the C.O. to remain loyal to the ideals thus expressed. The individual is constantly, either consciously or unconsciously, endeavoring

to bring about an adjustment between himself and his environment, and the 6,000 C.O.s previously mentioned found themselves face to face with a problem demanding almost immediate solution. The conflict was resolved dissimilarly as has been noted by the fact that some took a certain form of service, others a furlough, others accepted prison, some worked in prison, while some refused.

A careful analysis of the C.O. problem would require considerable time and an expression of the result of that analysis would consume more space than I am able now to devote to it. Many points have to be considered; the influence of one's relatives and friends; the persuasions of comrades and of officers in camp; the advice of spiritual or political mentors; the most expedient manner for one to attain his ideal; whether one could not accomplish more by compromising slightly thus saving his physical and mental energy for future aggressiveness; the matter of right or wrong and the ever present possibility that one may be mistaken in his attitude; the question of throwing up the sponge after the war is over and squirming out of the situation as gracefully as possible; the choice between two evils and whether it is proper to choose the greater or the lesser; and numerous ramifications of thought that these only suggest. In my own case I have experienced some alterations, and I have observed a change of tactics in others. All of which would require long explanations in addition to elucidating one's original attitude. Obviously, this is a study that warrants as much space as that that I have given to a recitation of comparisons, but it cannot be gone into thoroughly at this time. For instance: I refused to work up until a certain time, and that time was when I got my sentence. Then I worked until I discovered that it was inconsistent for me to work even under sentence. Five months in the dungeon, then a transfer to the open-air cantonment with the other C.O.s, followed by a transfer to Fort Douglas after a little more than a month in the sub-basement of Fort Leavenworth's Fourth Wing. Arriving at Fort Douglas, in common with the other C.O.s -- excepting Jacob Rose -- I volunteered to do the work incidental to my own cooking. Ten months of this and then I wrote to Secretary Baker explaining why I could no longer see my way clear to render such volunteer services. Finally my hunger strike. These various stages of activity carried with them no small amount of reasoning or lack of reasoning, whichever one may choose to call it. Anyway, I always had in mind the central point, that of living my ideal and of suffering for it when necessary, but always trying to avoid useless and inconsequential sacrifices.

What I have written will at least make clear that the C.O. stand is not without justification, although the facts warrant a deeper, fuller, and more careful exposition. I have attempted, although suffering under many handicaps, to present the main reasons for my attitude. And now I must leave to other judges the question of whether my actions are those of an insane or a sane person. I wish to conclude with a prayer that God will abundantly reward all those who have suffered because of my stand, and that He will enlighten and forgive those who have persecuted conscientious objectors.

¹ In an April 6, 1920 report from Fort Douglas, Utah, Army Psychiatrist Lt. E. B. M. Casey after examining Ben Salmon states: "Judgment is defective."

² A. Mitchell Palmer was Attorney General of the United States, 1919 - 1921.

³ Matthew 5:39: "But I say to you not to resist evil: but if one strike thee on thy right cheek, turn to him also the other."

⁴ Matthew 22:21, Mark 12:17, Luke 20:25.

⁵ James 3:18.

⁶ From The Battle-Field; poem by William Cullen Bryant, 1900.

⁷ Romans 12:19.

⁸ Written by Father Thomas Slater, S.J., St. Bueno's College, St. Asaph, Wales.

⁹ Psalms 126:1.

¹⁰ Matthew 6:12.

¹¹ The Law of Compensation derives from Ralph Waldo Emerson's essay Compensation, 1841. From that essay: "You cannot do wrong without suffering wrong."

¹² The Great Illusion; a study of the relation of military power to national advantage. Norman Angell, 1913, G.P. Putnam's Sons. 4th Edition.

¹³ The Fourteen Points were presented in a speech by President Wilson to Congress on January 8, 1918, which outlined principles for world peace after the World War.

¹⁴ Theodore Roosevelt was the 26th President of the United States from 1901 to 1909.

¹⁵ Supreme Court Justice Charles Evans Hughes was Republican candidate in the 1916 Presidential election and was defeated by the Democrat candidate Woodrow Wilson.

¹⁶ Eugene V. Debs, Socialist candidate for US President 5 times in early 1900s, was convicted under the Sedition Act of 1918 for a speech denouncing American participation in the World War and sentenced to a jail term of 10 years.

¹⁷ The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was signed March 3, 1918 by Germany, Austro-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Russia, ending Russian involvement in the World War.

¹⁸ James 2:17.

¹⁹ Romans 12:17.

²⁰ Matthew 26:53.

²¹ Lloyd George was Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, December 1916 to October 1922.

²² Terence MacSwiney was elected Sinn Fein Lord Mayor of Cork in March, 1920. He was arrested for sedition, tried by court martial, and sentenced to 2 years in Brixton Prison. He immediately started a hunger strike to protest being tried by a military court and being imprisoned. He died

October 20, 1920, after 73 days on the hunger strike.

23 Anima Christi is a traditional Catholic prayer originating in the 14th Century.

24 Scott Nearing graduated from the University of Pennsylvania with a PhD. in Economics in 1909. He worked as a Professor for several years and founded a national pacifist organization known as People's Council of America for Democracy and Peace in May 1917. One of his pamphlets resulted in his indictment under the Espionage Act in April 1918. A jury trial in February 1919 found him not guilty.

25 James Lewis was a Democratic Senator from Illinois from 1913 to 1919 and was also the Senate Majority Whip during that time.

26 General John J. Pershing, of the United States Army, led the American Expeditionary Forces in the World War, 1917 - 1918.

27 General Omar Bundy of the US Army was in command of the 1st Brigade, 1st Expeditionary Division in France during the World War.

28 Clyde H. Tavenner was a Democratic Representative from Illinois from March 1913 to March 1917.

29 John 10:10.

30 Cardinal James Gibbons was Bishop of Richmond from 1872 to 1877 and Archbishop of Baltimore from 1877 to 1921. He became a Cardinal in 1886.

31 From "The Arsenal at Springfield" by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, 1845.

32 Vladimir Lenin was head of the Russian Republic, 1917 to 1918, of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, 1918 to 1924, and of the Soviet Union, 1922 to 1924.

33 Patrick Joseph Hayes was Archbishop of New York, 1919 to 1938.

34 Matthew 5:22. "But I say to you that whosoever is angry with his brother, shall be in danger of the judgment."

35 Newton D. Baker was U.S. Secretary of War, 1916 to 1921.

36 The Truth Seeker is a periodical that "has championed science, secularism, and freedom of expression" since 1873. (quote from the website "thetruthseeker.net")